

The JOURNAL of
SOUTHERN
HISTORY

VOL. XI

NOVEMBER, 1945

No. 4



Published quarterly by the
SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME XI

NOVEMBER, 1945

NUMBER 4

Published Quarterly by
THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

BOARD OF EDITORS

FLETCHER M. GREEN
University of North Carolina

WESLEY F. CRAVEN
New York University

RUDOLPH L. BIESELE
University of Texas

THOMAS D. CLARK
University of Kentucky

BELL I. WILEY
University of Mississippi

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON
University of Kentucky

BERNARD MAYO
University of Virginia

KATHRYN ABBEY HANN
Rollins College

MANAGING EDITOR

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY, Vanderbilt University

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATE

NORA C. CHAFFIN, Vanderbilt University

GUARANTOR

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY

Correspondence in regard to contributions to the *Journal* should be sent to the Managing Editor, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.

The Southern Historical Association supplies the *Journal* to its members. The annual membership fee is three dollars; upon payment of fifty dollars, any person may become a life member. Single numbers of the *Journal* are available at seventy-five cents. Membership application and checks should be sent to James W. Patton, Secretary-Treasurer, North Carolina State College, Raleigh, North Carolina.

The Southern Historical Association disclaims responsibility for statements made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter April 5, 1935, at the Post Office at University Station, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Additional entry at Nashville, Tennessee.

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME XI

NOVEMBER, 1945

NUMBER 4



Copyright, 1945, by the Southern Historical Association

CONTENTS

<i>The Southern Experiment in Writing Social History.</i> By Charles S. Sydnor	455
<i>The Political Thinking of George Washington.</i> By Harold W. Bradley . .	469
<i>Propaganda in the Confederacy.</i> By James W. Silver	487
<i>The Teaching Techniques of the Farmers' Alliance: An Experiment in Adult Education.</i> By Homer Clevenger	504
<i>The Bourbon Period in Mississippi Politics, 1875-1890.</i> By (Miss) Willie D. Halsell	519
<i>Notes and Documents</i>	
Charleston Theatricals during the Tragic Decade, 1860-1869. By W. Stanley Hoole	538
An Interview with General Jubal A. Early in 1889. Edited by Martin F. Schmitt	547
<i>Book Reviews</i>	
Wright, <i>An Essay upon the Government of the English Plantations on the Continent of America (1701)</i> , by Stanley Pargellis	564
Andrews, <i>Jonathan Dickinson's Journal or, God's Protecting Providence</i> , by Alfred J. Hanna	565
May, <i>Principio to Wheeling: A Pageant of Iron and Steel</i> , by Festus P. Summers	567
Durkin, <i>John Dooley, Confederate Soldier: His War Journal</i> , by Bell I. Wiley	568
<i>Historical News and Notices</i>	
Personal	570
Historical Societies	574
Bibliographical	575
<i>Contributors</i>	587

The Southern Experiment in Writing Social History

BY CHARLES S. SYDNOR¹

A few years ago, in a day coach of a railroad train, an ancient peg-legged Confederate veteran began telling a stranger about the pleasures he anticipated at the reunion to which he was traveling. He had no baggage other than one clean shirt and a five-dollar bill; and he hoped to get back home, so he confided, without changing either. Turning to the past, he gave a detailed, gruesome, but dispassionate account of the amputation of his leg after Gettysburg without anaesthetic except straight whiskey and with no shelter but the tree beneath which the operation was performed.

The stranger, impressed by the little old man's equanimity toward the past and zest for the present, ventured to ask him what he thought about Northerners now that seventy years had passed since the battle of Gettysburg. Bristling up at once and peering about as though in search of his prey, he exclaimed: "I'd kill a damn Yankee now if I could find one!" Shying off a bit from so disturbing a topic, the stranger asked the veteran why he had gone to war; what he had been fighting for. The unhesitating answer was: "For the South!" As to the characteristics or the origin of this South for which he had sacrificed part of his body and risked all of it, the old man was not certain. But he was none the less sure of its reality. He knew that there was a South because he had been a part of it.

Many scholars, although lacking a similar body of personal experi-

¹ The substance of this paper was presented at the University of Michigan in the Graduate Study Program in American Culture and Institutions in 1940.

ences, have been in somewhat the same predicament as this old Confederate. Like him, they have sensed a reality which they could not define in an entirely satisfactory manner. But beyond this point the resemblance ceases. For the old soldier, it was enough to have felt and to have fought. Upon the student, however, there has been an obligation to describe and explain the Old South. The process by which he was led to undertake this task needs to be sketched, because whatever it was that awakened his interest in the South may well have determined the nature and bent of that interest.

Scholars were by no means the first to discover that the South was a region of distinctive characteristics. Long before the Civil War most Americans knew that the South was unique in respect to slavery. Abolitionists knew that it was distinguished by the enormity of its moral degradation; southern defenders were equally certain of its superiority in respect to religious orthodoxy, perfection of society, and other qualities. The presence of peculiar economic, social, and cultural traits was noted by visiting travelers and journalists; and it finally came about that a preference for a gray uniform rather than for a blue one was an obvious difference between Southerners and other Americans.

While these and other distinctions were becoming evident to the popular mind, historians paid little attention to the South as a whole. True enough, they wrote about the South, but their writings were essentially local history—histories of states and smaller areas—and biographies of southern men. They seemed to be but dimly, if at all, aware of the South as a distinctive, unique section; before the Civil War none of them wrote anything that could be called a history of the South. For that matter, until almost 1900, historical writings about the South continued to be, with a single exception, local history.²

The exception consisted in the development of interest in the Confederacy, and the emergence of this interest marks a great turning point in southern historiography. Here for the first time was a sub-

² E. Merton Coulter, "What the South Has Done About Its History," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), II (1936), 8, 10, 16.

ject that compelled writers to view the South as a whole even though for only a brief span of years. As unifying principles in Confederate history the writer could deal with the army, the government, and the struggle for independence.³ Inasmuch as most history in America and Europe was being written about military and political frameworks in the latter part of the nineteenth century, no great inventiveness in respect to organization was required of the early historians of the Confederacy.

The next epoch in southern historiography, which began near the turn of the century, was distinguished by an awakening interest in the ante-bellum period. Among the earliest writings were Edward Ingle's *Southern Sidelights*, published in 1896, and William G. Brown's *The Lower South in American History*, published in 1902. The twelve-volume collaborative work, *The South in the Building of the Nation*, appeared in 1909. In the meantime, Ulrich B. Phillips and William E. Dodd had begun to publish the results of their extensive research in this field, and with the passing of the years an increasing number of other scholars have studied and written about the Old South.

It is still necessary to do a certain amount of speculating about the forces that turned the attention of historians back into the period before the Civil War. Perhaps their interest in the Confederacy led them to probe the earlier period in the hope of discovering the reasons for its genesis. Perhaps there was a growing awareness that the Old South had come to a close and that it belonged to history rather than to the present. A host of novels and memoirs were saying that the Old South was a thing of the past and that it had a distinctive and delightful way of life. A dozen southern memoirs must have appeared in the last third of the nineteenth century for every one that had been published before 1861. The collapse of the Confederacy and the destruction of much that the Old South held dear was a major cause of this backward turning of the southern mind. To escape from the unpleasant realities of the post-war period, many men and women

³ Douglas S. Freeman, *The South to Posterity* (New York, 1939).

looked wistfully back to the days before that war and gladly reminisced to all who would listen. Some of them were moved by the determination to teach their children and grandchildren some of the things about the South that could not be learned in schoolbooks written in New England. Hence, they talked and wrote, fondly and uncritically, of the times when the Old South was in full flower and when they themselves were in the bloom of youth. Obviously, the reminiscences that were thus produced have defects as historical sources. But at least they serve to focus attention upon those characteristics of the Old South that the memoir writers thought were more distinctive; and they gave a wealth of detail about its customs, manners, institutions, and ways of life.⁴

While the memoir writers were proclaiming their ideas of what the Old South was like, Thomas Nelson Page and Joel Chandler Harris, and the playwrights, black-faced minstrels, and composers of popular songs were saying essentially the same thing to much larger audiences; namely, that the ante-bellum South was a land of steamboats and slavery, plantations and great houses, and of a distinctive and pleasant way of life. They were, in effect, saying to the historian that when he pushed back into the pre-Confederate period, he should abandon military and political patterns and build his work upon social and cultural themes.

Whatever the force that led historians to study the ante-bellum South, once they began its study they found that a political approach was difficult. The South had no separate government before 1861, and it lacked a regional political party. There was no solid South in politics before the Civil War like the solid South after Reconstruction. Southerners divided their votes, and they frequently divided them almost equally, between the Whig and Democratic parties; Clay, Van Buren, Jackson, William Henry Harrison, Polk, Taylor, and others could get votes in the South, but no one of them could get anything like all the votes of the South.

⁴ Frederica E. Duehring, "A Study of the Memoirs Published between 1865 and 1915 Concerning Civilian Life in Virginia" (M. A. thesis, Duke University, 1938).

While the data of southern history were repelling the historian from an outline based on political events, they were at the same time inducing him to think in terms of social phenomena. The historian of the South, unlike historians of the United States, France, or other countries, began without knowing the boundaries of the region he was studying. To determine them, he was compelled to decide what constituted the South, to give thought to its distinctive characteristics, and to discover the geographical incidence of these characteristics. Thus, he was driven from the problem of area back to the prior problem of essence: his initial task was to discover what the Old South was. From the nature of the case he was compelled to be a social historian. While political and constitutional questions have not been neglected, southern history is notable for its emphasis upon social and cultural topics.

In the years when studies of the ante-bellum South began to appear, there were few models for writing social history. The excellent introductory chapters of Henry Adams' *History of the United States during the Administrations of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison* had been published in 1889, and John B. McMaster's *History of the People of the United States* had begun to appear in 1883. But social history was yet in its formative years, and the student of southern history therefore had to invent new techniques and ways of thinking; he was compelled in some measure to be a pioneer in this field of historical writing.

Before commencing upon the ways in which historians of the Old South have experimented with the problems of constructing history about social and cultural patterns, it ought to be remarked that the difficulty of the undertaking was enhanced by the controversial nature of the subject. An obvious and vigorous controversy arose from the fact that the South was once at war with the rest of the nation. While animosities have subsided with the passing of the years, they are not yet entirely forgotten; and they were strong when southern history began to be written. The desire to prove that the South was right or wrong in its controversy with the North, and the use of southern history to support the racial prejudices of the historian have caused much confusion in a field that is difficult enough without these distractions.

If anyone wishes to test his own capacity for objectivity, he might try his hand at writing southern history or at reviewing what others have written.

A more subtle difficulty inherent in southern history is the cultural difference between the Old South and modern America. An historian, after acquiring some understanding of the vanished civilization of the Old South, then faces the task of explaining it to a people who lack the experiences to make some of his explanations comprehensible—to a people who have in some measure a different standard of values. One who writes about the Old South becomes aware that knowledge of his subject and impartiality are not enough; much skill and art are needed if a civilization that is gone is to be made comprehensible to men of the civilization that displaced it. Perhaps the historian can never hope to accomplish the task as well as the novelist can do it. At best, the historian may make a profound and penetrating analysis of a culture, but he is rarely able to make it breathe and move before the eyes of another generation of men.

Furthermore, it is by no means easy to avoid being led astray by inaccurate traditional interpretations of southern history. Two major perversions are widely current and firmly established: the South of the abolitionist, which has not yet entirely faded out of written national history; and the romanticized South of the composers of novels and memoirs, which has shown a remarkable power of survival and even of expansion. A quick and charming glimpse at the manner in which the romantic tradition developed is afforded in Harry Stillwell Edwards' *Eneas Africanus*. Substantial studies of the evolution of this tradition are to be found in Francis P. Gaines, *The Southern Plantation; A Study in the Development and the Accuracy of a Tradition*, and in Benjamin B. Kendrick and Alex M. Arnett, *The South Looks at Its Past*.

Finally, there has been the problem of balancing those things in the South that make it seem to have unity against those which seem to fragment it into parts. The South included such diversities as tide-water and piedmont, cotton kingdom and tobacco land, Democrats

and Whigs, country and town, planters and non-slaveholders, the liberalism of Jefferson and the conservatism of Calhoun. Each historian has been compelled to reach his own decision as to where the balance lies between the elements of homogeneity and the elements of heterogeneity and to work out as best he could a way of writing about the South that would permit him to treat it as a coherent whole without denying the presence of its many diversities.

To compensate in some measure for these problems and difficulties there is the fact that social organization came to rest in the Old South long enough to be closely observed. Except for westward expansion, which was mostly completed within the region before 1840, there was little change for thirty or more years before 1860. Activity continued, but within orbits that were becoming fixed and immutable. Even in its intellectual life, an important trend was toward an increasing defense and praise of the *status quo*—toward the creation of a regional mind as well as a regional body. As a further advantage to the social historian, the Old South, despite its name, was relatively young. Compared with many of the social orders known to history, that of the Old South was recent enough in origin for its history to be rather well documented and therefore susceptible of close study.

Such were some of the circumstances, advantages, and disadvantages under which southern history has been written. It remains for us to focus attention upon the ways in which historians of the Old South have experimented with the problem of how to write its history according to social and cultural patterns.

Much of their writing has been descriptive rather than narrative. Instead of following what may be called the classical historical outline—a chronological list of wars, dynasties, economic changes, and elections—the table of contents is likely to be a list of topics, such as slavery, the plantation, agriculture, cotton, tobacco, commerce, and schools and colleges, with little or no attention to the temporal sequence of events. In effect, the procedure has been to make a number of statements, saying that the Old South was unique in respect to this, that,

and the other characteristic. These statements, after being put into proper form, constitute the table of contents.

Among the descriptive assertions are the following: The South had long summers and heavy annual rainfall. In it were two races: white and black. Most of the Negroes were slaves; most of the white population was of British stock. Society was somewhat stratified. There was little manufacturing and much agriculture. A large part of the products of plantation and farm was shipped abroad. There was much objection to a protective tariff, to internal improvements at federal expense, and to proposals to homestead public lands. Speech was slow, but tempers were quick. Dueling was prevalent. Colleges were relatively numerous; public schools were few. In some aspects of life the unwritten code was more powerful than the written law. The Constitution of the United States was conservatively interpreted. Orthodoxy prevailed in religion, and religious and other "isms" were frowned upon. Victorian attitudes ruled family life. Toward its present state, the South was complacent; toward its past, romantic. It was subjected to much criticism, to which it reacted vigorously and belligerently. It was a self-conscious, sensitive minority in the nation.

When a book is written about half a dozen or so of these topics, and some books have been so written, or when a half dozen books, each dealing with a single one of these subjects, are placed side by side, the result is likely to resemble the contents of a small boy's pocket—a collection of all kinds of things that bear no apparent relationship to each other. While some writings about the South have followed this atomistic pattern, thoughtful historians have sought ways of fitting southern characteristics into patterns of relationship. A few of them have tried to find the one characteristic which is more important than all others, and which serves to explain a number of others. As early as 1903 Senator John Sharp Williams expressed the belief that when the history of the South was finally written "the philosophy of our sectional history—the purpose, conscious or unconscious, of our sectional strivings,—will be shown to have been always consistent, . . . that unvarying purpose being this; the preservation of our racial purity

and racial integrity—the supremacy in our midst of the white man's peculiar code of ethics and of the civilization growing out of it.”⁵ A quarter of a century later Ulrich B. Phillips made a better known and more elaborate presentation of essentially this same thesis.⁶ Taking a different view, Robert S. Cotterill declared in the preface to his volume, *The Old South*, that “if there be a central theme at all, it is in the development of Southern nationalism.”⁷ Explicitly or implicitly, others have expressed their belief in other “central themes,” and each has related much of southern history to the characteristic that he considers most important. A certain sort of unity is thereby achieved, and a book written by such a pattern may be comprehensible and intellectually satisfying.

Another way of bringing the characteristics of the South into relationship is to go back into earlier times and discover, if possible, their common ancestor. Instead of seeking to discover a central theme that runs through southern history, this approach seeks a first cause and then attempts to narrate subsequent developments in a chain-like series of cause and effect that can almost be reduced to the formula: *a* caused *b*, *b* caused *c*, *c* caused *d*, and so forth. While historians rarely state their cases so simply, for they must qualify, explain, and prove their assertions, this procedure has been approximated by several writers. The most notable example came from the pen of Ulrich B. Phillips, who began the first chapter of his *Life and Labor in the Old South* with the following paragraph:

Let us begin by discussing the weather, for that has been the chief agency in making the South distinctive. It fostered the cultivation of the staple crops, which promoted the plantation system, which brought the importation of negroes, which not only gave rise to chattel slavery but created a lasting race problem. These led to controversy and regional rivalry for power, which produced apprehensive reactions and culminated in a stroke for independence.

⁵ I am indebted to Professor William B. Hamilton for calling my attention to these words of Senator Williams. They are part of an address which Williams delivered before the Mississippi Historical Society and which was printed in its *Publications* (Oxford-Jackson, 1898-1925), VII (1903), 15.

⁶ Ulrich B. Phillips, “The Central Theme of Southern History,” in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XXXIV (1928), 30-43.

⁷ Robert S. Cotterill, *The Old South* (Glendale, California, 1936), 12.

Thus we have the house that Jack built, otherwise known for some years as the Confederate States of America.

While this statement has not been equaled in boldness by any other writer, there are fragmentary statements of a similar sort. To explain why South Carolina assumed a more threatening attitude at the time of nullification than New England had assumed at the Hartford Convention, Morison and Commager remark that "ten degrees of latitude separated Charleston from Boston. Climate and race relations had produced in the South Carolina aristocracy a different temper."⁸ Wilbur J. Cash, after asserting that the southern mind is prevailingly romantic and unrealistic but given to occasional outbursts of violence, finds the explanation thereof in the atmospheric haze that obscures clear, sharp vision and in the violence of sudden thunder storms.⁹ There have been many others who either by explicit statement or by the implication of introductory chapters on temperature and rainfall, length of day and growing season, mountain barriers and soil types, have held the forces of nature largely responsible for the creation of the southern way of life.¹⁰

A stimulating and needed protest against environmental over-emphasis has been formulated by Richard H. Shryock. After comparing the agricultural practices of German settlers with those of the English, he comes to this conclusion:

The significance of this contrast for the long-range history of the South is obvious enough. If the subject has been correctly presented, the difficulties of the section were not entirely determined by soil and climate but turned in part on the type of people who exploited these resources. The Anglo-Americans proved to be the sort who could use them best to immediate advantage, the German-Americans a type who could improve them for posterity. The dominance of the former group and their customs was at least one major factor

⁸ Samuel E. Morison and Henry S. Commager, *The Growth of the American Republic*, 2 vols. (New York, 1937), I, 372.

⁹ *The Mind of the South* (New York, 1936), 46-47. To avoid any unfairness to Cash, it should be noted that he does not regard the weather as the only force that created the mind of the South.

¹⁰ It might be noted that this interpretation bears a strong resemblance to the frontier thesis of Frederick J. Turner and to an important thesis in his *The Significance of Sections in American History* (New York, 1932).

in bringing on agricultural difficulties, continued colonial dependence, colonial protests, and, finally, a second war for independence—in about that chronological order. Here again is what Professor Phillips would have termed a “house that Jack built,” but one with a different foundation from that which he described.¹¹

This statement had broad implication, which is that the historian of the South ought to take as one of his starting points the original stocks of humanity, their physical characteristics, their knowledge of the arts and sciences, their theories and practices of social organization, their attitude toward work and wealth, their religious beliefs, their customs and expectations in respect to government. A few, but all too few, have approached southern history from this starting point, and most of these have dealt only with the early colonial period.¹² There are hardly any who have tried to trace and to evaluate the influence of imported cultures through long sweeps of time, or who have sought to measure the effect of an identical environment upon two different but neighboring cultural groups.¹³

Likewise, there have been some historians who have concerned themselves with cultural importations into the South after the early settlements had been established. Perhaps most work of this kind has been done in attempts to relate the political philosophy of the revolutionary generation, especially that of Thomas Jefferson, to its British and European antecedents. Something also is known about the transmission of ideas into the South through northern and foreign teachers or through the return of southern youth who had been educated outside their region. But far too little is known about the successive importations of knowledge, by immigrants or by writing, about medicine,

¹¹ “Cultural Factors in the History of the South,” in *Journal of Southern History*, V (1939), 343-44.

¹² Among the more distinguished of recent works of this kind are Louis B. Wright, *The First Gentlemen of Virginia* (San Marino, California, 1940); and Thomas J. Wertenbaker, *The Old South* (New York, 1942). Virginia far more than other southern states has been studied by those interested in the cultural background of the early settlers.

¹³ A study of agricultural differences between neighboring cultural groups is Walter M. Kollmorgen, *The German-Swiss in Franklin County, Tennessee: A Study of the Significance of Cultural Considerations in Farming Enterprises* (Washington, 1940).

agricultural chemistry, engineering, law, and humanitarian reforms; about the useful and the fine arts; or about styles, customs, and new modes of thought. These and other influences from the outside world were shaping the South as surely as were the forces of nature, but historians have devoted less attention to them.

Here then are two ways that have been evolved of writing narrative histories of the development of southern society. One describes the shaping of a unique civilization under the strong fingers of nature. The other begins with the original stock of men and women, with all that was in their heads and hearts, and tells how they reproduced and perpetuated a way of life after the fashion of what they had known in the Old World. It goes without saying that the difference between these two schools is one of emphasis; neither totally disregards the other. Each of them, or better still a combination of the two, affords a way of getting the data of southern history into a pattern and of accounting for the evolution of the Old South.

But if the historian restricts himself entirely to these two forces, nature and cultural importation, he is likely to assume that man acts in a predictable manner and that he lacks sufficient internal force or will to throw off the chains of heritage or to overcome his present surroundings. He seems to imply that forces beyond the control of man slowly and relentlessly molded the South into something different from the rest of the nation and created a state of conflict between the two.

Inasmuch as the assumption that man has no freedom of choice, which lies behind so mechanistic an interpretation of history, can neither be proved nor disproved to the satisfaction of all men, each historian must proceed by faith and intuition. In biographies and in histories that give considerable attention to individuals there is frequently evident a belief that man is in some measure master of his destiny; but in those essays that attempt with broad strokes to sketch and explain southern history, emphasis is more often upon cultural persistence or the forces of nature than upon human decision.

Such protests as have been registered against this fatalistic inter-

pretation frequently take the form of assertions that the Civil War was not an "irrepressible conflict." Avery Craven argues in a volume with the significant title, *The Repressible Conflict*, that: "Civil war was the product of emotions slowly intensified through the years, and not of natural factors inherent in the early sectionalism of either North or South. . . . Men fought because they had come to fear and hate—because they had at last accepted a distorted picture of both themselves and the people in other sections."¹⁴ Dwight L. Dumond, in his *Antislavery Origins of the Civil War in the United States*, comes to the conclusion that the fateful attack upon slavery was not caused by economic forces but began as "an intellectual and religious crusade for moral reform."¹⁵ Charles W. Ramsdell has placed much of the responsibility for the resort to arms upon a single decision made by Abraham Lincoln.¹⁶ These and other examples that might be mustered illustrate yet a third way of explaining the course of events in the South—a way that emphasizes the decisions of individuals and that frequently uses the language of psychology. However, history written after this pattern seldom attempts to account for the origins of southern characteristics except such as lie in the realm of attitudes and viewpoints.

Such are the chief ways in which southern history has been written, the ways in which historians have experimented in this field with the writing of social and cultural history. Viewed as an experiment, the literature of southern history has general significance because many scholars with no interest in this field are nevertheless interested in the problem of how to keep social history from resembling the unrelated contents of a scrap-bag. But this body of writing has a deeper significance. While struggling with problems of organization and composition, historians have come to grips with the more fundamental problem of discovering what was most essential in the civilization of the Old South and of explaining why such a civilization came into existence.

¹⁴ *The Repressible Conflict* (Baton Rouge, 1939), 30, 63.

¹⁵ *Antislavery Origin of the Civil War in the United States* (Ann Arbor, 1939), 1, note 1.

¹⁶ "Lincoln and Fort Sumter," in *Journal of Southern History*, III (1937), 259-88.

It would make little difference to the present and the future whether the South was right or wrong at critical, controversial points in its history; but it is conceivable that an understanding of its evolution might be of help today and tomorrow; for the thing that took place in the South has taken place many times and in many parts of the world. Here a people developed a kind of economic life, of social organization, and of cultural interests and aspirations which, if not unique in each of its parts, was unique in the synthesis of the parts into a distinctive civilization. So it has been in other parts of the United States and so has it been with other peoples throughout the world. Carried to a great length, this sort of a movement may evenuate in a new nation. With problems of regionalism and nationalism pressing so heavily upon the world, it would assuredly be useful if there were more knowledge of the forces that differentiate men into variant civilizations and of how these forces operate. On this subject, students of the Old South have had something to say and it is conceivable that they may yet have more and wiser things to say.

Despite all that has hitherto been done in this field, it may well be that there are fruitful ways of interpreting southern history which have not yet been applied to the problem and perhaps have not yet been imagined. But while interpretations now in vogue may not be sufficiently inclusive, they are at least unconfused by a priori reasoning based on cyclic and rhythmic philosophies of history.¹⁷ Furthermore, southern historians seem to have been more skeptical than many American historians of the idea of inevitable progress. It has been difficult for those who were studying the development of a civilization that came to a mighty downfall to assume that Providence or nature has done everything for the best. Historians of the Old South have generally been able to study change without labeling it as progress. If their work can continue in this mood of wholesome skepticism and with a diminution of prejudices arising from race and place, they may throw yet more light on the process by which mankind has been fragmented into differing civilizations.

¹⁷ A convenient summary of the major philosophies and interpretations of history is in Allan Nevins, *The Gateway to History* (Boston, 1938), especially chapter IX.

The Political Thinking of George Washington

BY HAROLD W. BRADLEY

It has become an axiom among historians that the period of the establishment of national government in the United States was one in which the republic was blessed with a remarkable group of political leaders, among whom were a few men with unusual insight into the problems and institutions of government. Foremost among these political giants were Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson, who not only founded and led political parties but who succeeded in impressing upon those parties their own views upon the nature and function of government and the appropriate relationship between government and the citizen. Second to Hamilton and Jefferson in the quality of leadership, but equal to them in the realm of political thinking, were John Adams and James Madison. These four men constituted a quartet which has not been surpassed and perhaps has not been equaled in the history of political thought in the United States. The enduring quality of their contributions to political practice and theory has led historians to dismiss with little consideration the ideas of the man who more than any other was at the center of political activity during the early years of the republic. All too often, President Washington appears in history only as a dignified and colorless figure moving mysteriously in the political background, supporting the program of Hamilton, succumbing to the influence of his Secretary of the Treasury, and associated in the popular mind with the Hamiltonian concepts of government.

There is historical justification for thus subordinating the role of

Washington in his own administration. He may have been "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen," but quite conspicuously he was not first in politics. He did not wish to be a politician and he did not seek to become a mold of political forces. His warning in the Farewell Address against "the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally" was doubtless the heartfelt expression of his own disillusionment after nearly eight years of active political life. But it was a warning which he might have uttered with as much sincerity at the opening of his presidency as at its close. If Washington deliberately avoided the role of political leader, he would seem equally miscast as a political philosopher. He was neither a phrase maker nor an original thinker. His public papers and his private correspondence are filled with pleasant platitudes reflecting the accepted virtues of his day. Thus, when about to assume the presidency, he assured Lafayette that nothing more than "harmony, honesty, industry and frugality" were needed "to make us a great and happy people";¹ and in his first inaugural he declared that "there is no truth more thoroughly established than that there exists . . . an indissoluble union between virtue and happiness; between duty and advantage."² Six years later, while bitter political strife swirled about him, he informed a correspondent that "in politics, as in religion" the principles upon which he acted were "few and simple," and of these the most important was "to be honest and just . . . and to exact it from others."³

One may search the public papers of Washington without finding a concise statement of political philosophy. The greater part of the eight annual messages to Congress were devoted to matter-of-fact descriptions of the state of the Union. Among the topics discussed in those messages, foreign relations and Indian affairs received the most attention. Of the great issues of domestic policy which divided

¹ Washington to Marquis de Lafayette, January 29, 1789, in John C. Fitzpatrick (ed.), *The Writings of George Washington*, 37 vols. (Washington, 1931-1940), XXX, 186. This collection is cited hereinafter as *Writings*.

² James D. Richardson (comp.), *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897*, 10 vols. (Washington, 1896-1899), I, 53.

³ Washington to Dr. James Anderson, December 24, 1795, in *Writings*, XXXIV, 407.

the nation during his first administration, only the enforcement of the excise laws was given more than perfunctory notice in the reports to Congress. These messages contain frequent references to the economic conditions of the day. In his recommendations to Congress, agriculture, commerce, and manufactures were almost invariably linked together, as indeed they had come to be in his thinking. He urged Congress and his fellow countrymen to support religion, morality, education, and science, and he suggested the establishment of a national university with the observation that existing institutions lacked the funds necessary to command "the ablest professors in the different departments of liberal knowledge."⁴ It is also evident from his public papers that Washington, as President, favored a strong constitutional government which would be responsive ultimately to the public will but which would not be subject to the whims or caprice of a temporary majority. These were cautious statements of a conservative philosophy; under close scrutiny they do not appear to have been Hamiltonian. They were, instead, the guarded public expressions of political ideas which Washington had stated freely to his friends in private correspondence during the years of relative leisure at Mount Vernon from 1783 to 1789.

The practical figure of the first President seems curiously remote from the realm of abstract ideas. Washington, however, appears to have fancied himself as something of an amateur philosopher—at least in the field of political thought. His private correspondence is filled with allusions to the delights of the philosophically minded—a category in which obviously he included himself. Perhaps a better clue to his self-analysis is his description of himself, in a letter to Lafayette, as "a Philanthropist by character, and . . . a Citizen of the great republic of humanity at large."⁵ This self-portrait of the prosaic Virginia farmer sitting in his home above the Potomac and passing philosophical judgments upon the policies and aspirations of men on both sides of the Atlantic is one which may amaze the historian. It suggests, how-

⁴ Richardson (comp.), *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, I, 202.

⁵ Washington to Lafayette, August 15, 1786, in *Writings*, XXVIII, 520.

ever, a mind which had thought carefully if not profoundly upon the fundamental political issues of his day. The product of this thought may be found scattered through hundreds of letters to intimate friends or even to casual correspondents.

A survey of this correspondence and of his official career indicates that the dominant note in the political thinking of Washington, both before and after 1789, was his unwavering belief that only a strong central government, able to determine and enforce national policies, would enable the United States to assume its appropriate position among the nations of the world. This conviction was the product of experience rather than of meditation. As commander of the army, Washington felt a natural sympathy for the plight of his unpaid men, and while counseling them against rash measures he urged Congress and the states to recognize the services of the army by making provision for the payment of the money due the soldiers.⁶ It was the states, he believed, which were delinquent in this matter rather than Congress, and he felt for the states the same distrust that he felt for private debtors who refused to honor their obligations. Furthermore, Washington by his very position as commander of the army had been compelled to transcend local interests to become a national figure concerned with national aspirations and national policies. The members of Congress were the representatives of the states, but he had been the repository of national hope and of such national power as could be created. The inevitable conflict between a civilian Congress responsible to local feeling and the commander of an army in the field had confirmed him in his suspicion of too much local autonomy. With reason, and probably with some emotion, he informed Hamilton, in March, 1783, that no man in the country could be "more deeply impressed" with the necessity of strengthening the federal government because no man had felt more keenly "the bad effects" of a diffusion

⁶ Washington to Alexander Hamilton, March 4, 1783, *ibid.*, XXVI, 186-87; Washington to John A. Washington, June 15, 1783, *ibid.*, XXVII, 13. To Hamilton, Washington wrote that the "predicament" in which he found himself as both citizen and soldier had been "the Subject of many contemplative hours."

of authority.⁷ Three months later, in a circular letter addressed to the individual states, he asserted that he could prove "to every mind open to conviction" that the war might have been won in less time and with less expense had Congress possessed greater energy and greater power.⁸ He suggested the remedy in a letter to a prospective historian of the Revolution, the Reverend William Gordon. The people, Washington complained, were content to know only that the war had been fought and won and they had failed to inquire why the victory had been so long delayed or the cost so great. These difficulties, he explained, had been caused in large measure by a "want of energy in the Federal Constitution"; the remedy for this political disease was "a Convention of the People" which would confer the necessary power upon the central government.⁹ At the close of the year, he sounded a more ominous note in his final orders to the army, asserting that "unless the principles of the federal government were properly supported and the powers of the union increased, the honour, dignity, and justice of the nation would be lost forever."¹⁰

Washington was candid in his hope that the Articles of Confederation would be amended or superseded by a constitution which would provide the federal government with increased power and which would free it from a slavish dependence upon the whims and local concerns of the states. In this matter, however, he was not an extremist. In urging a redistribution of powers he employed vague language, being content merely to suggest that Congress be granted "sufficient powers" to give "consistency, stability and dignity" to the federal government, or—as he more often expressed it—the powers necessary for "general purposes."¹¹ What those powers should be was left to the imagination

⁷ Washington to Hamilton, March 31, 1783, *ibid.*, XXVI, 277.

⁸ The circular, dated Newburgh, June 8, 1783, is in *ibid.*, XXVI, 483-96. The statement cited is on p. 495.

⁹ Washington to William Gordon, July 8, 1783, *ibid.*, XXVII, 49.

¹⁰ "Farewell Orders to the Armies of the United States," November 2, 1783, *ibid.*, XXVII, 226.

¹¹ Washington to Lafayette, April 5, 1783, *ibid.*, XXVI, 298; Washington to Tench Tilghman, April 24, 1783, *ibid.*, XXVI, 359; Washington to John A. Washington, June 15, 1783, *ibid.*, XXVII, 12.

At a dinner given in his honor at Annapolis on December 22, 1783, Washington

of his correspondents and of the historian, but his satisfaction with the Constitution of 1787 seems to offer a clue to his views as to the proper spheres of state and federal authority.

Washington returned to Mount Vernon at the close of 1783, content with the prospect of ending his career as a gentleman farmer and amateur philosopher. He retired to private life with foreboding that the eight years of struggle might yet prove to have been futile, but these gloomy thoughts were balanced by the conviction that with "a little political wisdom" the United States might become as "populous and happy" as its territory was extensive.¹² Although he traveled little in the next three years, he did not lose contact with the outside world. Scarcely a week passed that invited or uninvited guests did not come to Mount Vernon to share his hospitality, for which they paid with idle gossip or news of events on either side of the ocean. More important among his sources of information was an extensive correspondence with men of prominence in this country and in Europe. To a privileged few of these correspondents he freely confessed his growing fear that the potential greatness of the new republic was being sacrificed on the altar of pride and jealousy of thirteen quarreling states.¹³ When the delicate problem of national and state finances led to a demand for the issuance of paper money and then to the threat of civil war in some of the states, the residue of optimism with which he had returned to Mount Vernon disappeared. As he read reports of Shays' Rebellion and of the paper money struggle in Rhode Island, his faith in the wisdom and rectitude of the people was severely shaken. To correspondents who turned to him for counsel, he indicated his own wish that the powers of the central government should be greatly strengthened, though he thought that proposals which would virtually eliminate the powers of the individual states were too radical to be

offered the toast, "Competent powers to Congress for general purposes." James Tilton to Gunning Bedford, December 25, 1783, *ibid.*, XXVII, 285-86n.

¹² Washington to Sir Edward Newenham, June 10, 1784, *ibid.*, XXVII, 417.

¹³ See, for example, Washington to Benjamin Harrison, January 18, 1784, *ibid.*, XXVII, 305-306; Washington to James Madison, November 30, 1785, *ibid.*, XXVIII, 336; Washington to Bushrod Washington, November 15, 1786, *ibid.*, XXIX, 68.

acceptable to the majority of the people.¹⁴ He noted that "even respectable characters" contemplated the establishment of a monarchy "without horror."¹⁵ He would not approve so drastic a step until all other measures failed; but in a letter to Madison, written at the close of March, 1787, he indicated a tacit acquiescence in this remedy if the proposed increase in the powers of Congress should fail to produce an efficient government which could command the respect of the people.¹⁶

Recent historical studies have suggested that the years from 1781 to 1787 were less critical than John Fiske supposed. Washington, however, would have subscribed without reservation to the statement that they were indeed the "critical period." Alarmed by what he regarded as painful evidence that the nation was on the verge of disintegrating in disorder and dishonor, he welcomed the call for the Philadelphia Convention and he accepted the new constitution with unfeigned satisfaction as the only alternative to anarchy.¹⁷ He did not regard the proposed constitution as perfect, frankly confessing that it contained much which did not meet his "*cordial* approbation."¹⁸ There is no clue as to what provisions he would have altered, nor is there any clear evidence as to whether he agreed with those who regretted that even greater power had not been granted to the federal government. It is apparent, however, that he did not favor conferring unlimited power upon any political authority, including presumably the central government. He assured his nephew, Bushrod Washington, that no man was "a warmer advocate" of "proper restraints and wholesome checks in every department of government";¹⁹ and in writing to Lafayette he defended the Constitution as one which contained "more checks and barriers against the introduction of Tyranny" than any yet devised by

¹⁴ Washington to Henry Knox, February 3, 1787, *ibid.*, XXIX, 153; Washington to David Humphreys, March 8, 1787, *ibid.*, XXIX, 172-73; Washington to the Secretary for Foreign Affairs [John Jay], March 10, 1787, *ibid.*, XXIX, 176.

¹⁵ Washington to Jay, August 1, 1786, *ibid.*, XXVIII, 503.

¹⁶ Washington to Madison, March 31, 1787, *ibid.*, XXIX, 190.

¹⁷ Washington to Charles Carter, December 14, 1787, *ibid.*, XXIX, 339.

¹⁸ Washington to Governor Edmund Randolph, January 8, 1788, *ibid.*, XXIX, 358.

¹⁹ Washington to Bushrod Washington, November 10, 1787, *ibid.*, XXIX, 312.

men.²⁰ Eight years later, in the Farewell Address, he asserted that "the efficient management" of public business required "a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty."²¹ In view of the political situation in 1796, it is probable that this rather vague statement of principle was intended as a warning against any weakening of the federal authority rather than as a plea for an increase in its powers.

Washington's views on other great issues of his day were generally less emphatic and occasionally reflected inconsistencies. This is particularly true of his judgments as to the validity of the democratic processes. During his last year in the army and the first year of his retirement at Mount Vernon he avoided a direct commitment upon this delicate problem. He did indeed assert, in 1783, that Congress was "in fact . . . the People,"²² and he argued that it could not be dangerous to increase the powers of Congress, for its members were "the creatures of the people," to whose wishes they were completely amenable.²³ More significant, perhaps, was his advocacy of short sessions of Congress which would permit the delegates to return to their homes and mingle with their constituents. Such a procedure would be reciprocally beneficial, for the Congressmen could explain national problems to their fellow citizens and in turn they would become "better acquainted" with the sentiments of the people whom they represented.²⁴ In 1786, he modified this theme somewhat in a letter to his nephew, Bushrod Washington. He declared that he did not question the thesis that representatives "ought to be the mouth of their Constituents," nor would he deny the right of the latter to give instructions to their delegates in the legislature. He contrasted, however, the position of representatives

²⁰ Washington to Lafayette, February 7, 1788, *ibid.*, XXIX, 410-11.

²¹ Richardson (comp.), *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, I, 218.

²² Washington to Harrison, March 4, 1783, in *Writings*, XXVI, 184.

²³ Washington to Gordon, July 8, 1783, *ibid.*, XXVII, 51; Washington to Harrison, January 18, 1784, *ibid.*, XXVII, 306. In view of the fact that Congress was then the sole repository of central authority, these statements may be regarded as more of a defense of the central government than an expression of sympathy with a democratically controlled legislature.

²⁴ Washington to Thomas Jefferson, March 29, 1784, *ibid.*, XXVII, 377.

in state legislatures with those in Congress. The latter were compelled to deal with national issues upon which the people were often poorly informed, and they must consider the welfare of the entire nation rather than the interests of a single locality. If Congressmen, therefore, were bound by instructions from their constituents, great national issues would be decided on the basis of local interests and insufficient knowledge.²⁵ This was a middle-of-the-road doctrine. It fell far short of the views of the democratically inclined anti-Federalists, but it reflected none of the indifference to the wishes of the public commonly attributed to the Federalists.

By the summer of 1785, Washington's faith in the wisdom of the people was being shaken by the refusal of individual states to cooperate with Congress in forming a national policy. The people, he several times complained, "must feel" before they would see or act.²⁶ The news of the insurrection in western Massachusetts drove him still farther along the road of disillusionment, and in apparent despair he wrote to John Jay that "we have probably had too good an opinion of human nature in forming our confederation," and added that experience taught that men would not "adopt and carry into execution measures . . . calculated for their own good, without the intervention of coercive power."²⁷ In a similar mood, he addressed to David Humphreys the rhetorical inquiry, "What, gracious God, is man! that there should be such inconsistency and perfidiousness in his conduct?"²⁸

The state of the nation in 1786 had temporarily destroyed Washington's belief in the ultimate wisdom of the people, but his disillusion-

²⁵ Washington to Bushrod Washington, September 30, November 15, 1786, *ibid.*, XXIX, 22-23, 67.

²⁶ Washington to G. W. Fairfax, June 30, 1785, *ibid.*, XXVIII, 183-84; Washington to Lafayette, July 25, 1785, *ibid.*, XXVIII, 208; Washington to David Humphreys, March 8, 1787, *ibid.*, XXIX, 173. To Lafayette he added that "the people will be right at last."

²⁷ Washington to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs [John Jay], August 1, 1786, *ibid.*, XXVIII, 502. See also, Washington to Madison, March 31, 1787, *ibid.*, XXIX, 190-91. Washington's skepticism was shared by Jay, who already had reached the conclusion that the "wise and good never form the majority of any large society." Jay to Dr. Richard Price, September 27, 1785, in Henry P. Johnston (ed.), *The Correspondence and Public Papers of John Jay*, 4 vols. (New York, 1890-1893), III, 168.

²⁸ Washington to David Humphreys, December 26, 1786, in *Writings*, XXIX, 125-26.

ment was not permanent, and the events of 1787 and 1788 largely restored his faith. He returned to Mount Vernon from the Philadelphia Convention still fearing that "the multitude are often deceived by externals,"²⁹ but when by August, 1788, eleven states had ratified the Constitution, Washington became confident that "the People when rightly informed will decide in a proper manner."³⁰ His recent skepticism was conveniently forgotten, and he proudly informed Lafayette that he had never believed that the United States would become "an awful monument" to the doctrine that "Mankind, under the most favourable circumstances . . . are unequal to the task of Governing themselves."³¹ In March, 1789, he believed that it would be "necessary . . . to conciliate the good will of the People" inasmuch as it would be impossible "to build the edifice of public happiness, but upon their affections."³² He had returned to a qualified belief in democracy, and with this belief he entered the presidency. Apparently he held similar views after eight months in that office, for in January, 1790, he declared that he had always believed that "an unequivocally free and equal Representation of the People in the Legislature, together with an efficient and responsible [*sic*] Executive, were the great Pillars on which the preservation of American Freedom must depend."³³ As he approached the period of conflict within the cabinet between Hamilton and Jefferson, he stood midway between the two antagonists in his views on democracy.

The vicissitudes of the presidency provided a serious test of Washington's wavering views concerning democracy. The unexpected bitterness of the opposition to the policies of his administration, the disillusioning breach with Jefferson, and his growing dependence upon Hamilton were factors which might have shaken a stronger faith than his in the efficacy of democratic institutions. It is clear that he was distressed by that inescapable adjunct of democratic government, the rise of partisan opposition to the government in power. When this

²⁹ Washington to Madison, October 10, 1787, *ibid.*, XXIX, 285.

³⁰ Washington to Charles Pettit, August 16, 1788, *ibid.*, XXX, 41.

³¹ Washington to Lafayette, June 19, 1788, *ibid.*, XXIX, 526.

³² Washington to Samuel Vaughan, March 21, 1789, *ibid.*, XXX, 240.

³³ Washington to Catherine Macaulay Graham, January 9, 1790, *ibid.*, XXX, 496.

political division invaded his cabinet, he urged both Hamilton and Jefferson to cultivate a tolerance of opposing views and to accept in good faith the decisions of Congress and the executive. He reluctantly admitted that differences in political opinion were unavoidable, but he declared that it would be difficult if not impossible "to manage the Reins of Government" unless there were "mutual forbearances, and temporising yieldings *on all sides*."³⁴ The appearance of so-called "Democratic Societies" as centers of opposition to the policies of the national government aroused mingled apprehension and indignation in his mind. He attributed the resistance to the excise laws to the machinations of those societies and asserted that their influence, if not counteracted, "would shake the government to its foundation."³⁵ By 1795, Washington's patience with partisan opposition had reached the vanishing point. He seems to have been both surprised and annoyed by the hostility to the treaty with Great Britain, and when both the treaty and its friends were denounced in public gatherings he took the extreme position that "meetings in opposition to the constituted authorities" were "*at all times*, improper and dangerous."³⁶ There is no evidence, however, that Washington realized that his thinking had come dangerously close to a negation of the democratic spirit. Nor did he yet regard himself as a partisan. In writing to one of the most partisan of his supporters, Timothy Pickering, Washington described himself as a man "of no party . . . whose sole wish is to pursue, with undeviating steps a path which would lead this Country to respectability, wealth and happiness."³⁷ One year later, in the Farewell Address, he devoted much attention to the danger of partisanship, declaring that it was indeed the "worst enemy" of popular government.³⁸

³⁴ Washington to Jefferson, August 23, 1792, *ibid.*, XXXII, 130-31; Washington to Hamilton, August 26, 1792, *ibid.*, XXXII, 132-33.

³⁵ Washington to Henry Lee, August 26, 1794, *ibid.*, XXXIII, 475-76; Washington to Burges Ball, September 25, 1794, *ibid.*, XXXIII, 506-507; Washington to John Jay, November 1, 1794, *ibid.*, XXXIV, 17.

³⁶ Washington to John Adams, August 20, 1795, *ibid.*, XXXIV, 280.

³⁷ Washington to Timothy Pickering, July 27, 1795, *ibid.*, XXXIV, 251.

³⁸ Richardson (comp.), *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, I, 218. A year in re-

To the end of his life, Washington failed to recognize the close relationship between partisan politics and the practical expression of the views of the majority. There was no conscious inconsistency, therefore, between his hostility to parties and his continued confidence in the wisdom of the people. During the closing year of his presidency and thereafter, he several times asserted that the mass of the citizens needed only to understand a question to decide it properly;³⁹ and as the crisis with France approached a climax he declared that the sentiments of the majority "*ought to be unequivocally known*," as it was "the right of the People" that their will should be put into effect.⁴⁰ He declared that, as president, it had always been his "earnest desire to learn, and to comply, as far as is consistent, with the public sentiment," but this was modified by his belief that such an expression of popular will could be valid "*on great occasions only*" and after there had been opportunity for "cool and deliberate reflection" on the part of the public.⁴¹ After nine months in the relative calm of Mount Vernon he reiterated this general opinion. During periods of crisis, he believed, reason abdicated and men were ruled by passions, but when these passions subsided and the "empire" of reason was restored those public servants who pursued "the paths of truth, moderation and justice" would regain the public confidence and their just influence.⁴² This was a comforting hope, and to Washington it appeared to justify a basic confidence in the wisdom of the people. In principle, it appears to place him closer to Jefferson and Madison than to the Federalist

tirement did not modify Washington's views on this vital issue. In March, 1798, at a time when his successor was beset with opposition similar to that experienced by Washington, he asserted that "misrepresentation and party feuds have arisen to such a height, as to distort truth and to become portentous of the most serious consequences, . . . whether they can end at any point short of confusion and anarchy is *now* in my opinion more problematical than ever." Washington to Alexander White, March 1, 1798, in *Writings*, XXXVI, 175-76.

³⁹ Washington to Jay, May 8, 1796, *ibid.*, XXXV, 37; Washington to John Marshall, December 4, 1797, *ibid.*, XXXVI, 93; Washington to Alexander Addison, June 3, 1798, *ibid.*, XXXVI, 280; Washington to James Lloyd, February 11, 1799, *ibid.*, XXXVII, 129.

⁴⁰ Washington to Thomas Pinckney, May 28, 1797, *ibid.*, XXXV, 453.

⁴¹ Washington to Edward Carrington, May 1, 1796, *ibid.*, XXXV, 32.

⁴² Washington to John Luzac, December 2, 1797, *ibid.*, XXXVI, 84.

leadership with which he had been associated during the latter part of his presidency.

The moderate conservatism which prompted Washington to accept a qualified democracy was reflected more clearly in his belief in a balanced economy. Washington was a farmer with the true farmer's love of the land, believing that "the life of a Husbandman" was of all vocations "the most delectable."⁴³ Agriculture, he asserted, was "the proper source of American wealth and happiness";⁴⁴ and he predicted that Americans would continue to be "an agricultural people . . . for ages to come."⁴⁵ Holding these views, he could assure Jefferson, in 1788, that "the introduction of any thing" which might divert the attention of the people from agricultural pursuits "must be extremely prejudicial, if not ruinous to us."⁴⁶

Gradually, however, Washington became convinced of the value of commerce and manufacturing in the life of a nation. In 1784 he had admitted to Jefferson that commerce had "its advantages and disadvantages"; and a year later he observed that it was a question debated "among Philosophers and wise men" as to whether foreign commerce was "of real advantage" to a nation.⁴⁷ By 1786, his hitherto uncertain views appeared to be taking more definite shape, for he informed Lafayette that he reflected "with pleasure" that commerce would have a beneficial effect upon "human manners and society," uniting mankind "like one great family in fraternal ties."⁴⁸ He was not prepared to comment on the economic consequences of commerce, but in March,

⁴³ Washington to Alexander Spotswood, February 13, 1788, *ibid.*, XXIX, 414. In writing to Arthur Young, he described agriculture as "a subject, which may be more conducive than almost any other to the happiness of mankind." Washington to Young, December 4, 1788, *ibid.*, XXX, 153.

⁴⁴ Washington to Theodorick Bland, August 15, 1786, *ibid.*, XXVIII, 517; Washington to Samuel Chamberline, April 3, 1788, *ibid.*, XXIX, 455.

⁴⁵ Washington to Lafayette, August 15, 1786, *ibid.*, XXVIII, 519.

⁴⁶ Washington to Jefferson, January 1, 1788, *ibid.*, XXIX, 351.

⁴⁷ Washington to Jefferson, March 29, 1784, *ibid.*, XXVII, 376; Washington to James Warren, October 7, 1785, *ibid.*, XXVIII, 290.

⁴⁸ Washington to Lafayette, August 15, 1786, *ibid.*, XXVIII, 520-21. In December, 1786, Washington wrote to Governor Edmund Randolph of Virginia that the encouragement of manufacturing was "certainly consistent with that sound policy which ought to actuate every State." Washington to Randolph, December 25, 1786, *ibid.*, XXIX, 120.

1789, on the eve of assuming the presidency, he informed a correspondent in Ireland that although American prosperity "must depend essentially" upon agriculture, the "useful arts and commerce ought not . . . to be altogether neglected."⁴⁹ Among the "useful arts" to which he referred was manufacturing. He did not wish to "force the introduction of manufactures, by extravagant encouragements, and to the prejudice of agriculture," but he suggested, in January, 1789, that much might be accomplished in manufacturing through the labor of women and children "without taking one really necessary hand from tilling the earth."⁵⁰ A year later, in his first annual message to Congress, he declared that the "safety and interest" of the nation required the development of such manufactures as would render it independent of other nations for essential goods and particularly for military supplies.⁵¹ The policies of his administration have generally been regarded as more conducive to the expansion of manufacturing than to the encouragement of the farmers. This was not, on his part, a deliberate slighting of the agricultural population. Near the close of his administration he reaffirmed his personal loyalty to agriculture as a way of life, asserting that it was the occupation most congenial to his "nature and gratifications";⁵² and in the last of the annual messages to Congress he reasserted his conviction that "with reference either to individual or national welfare agriculture is of primary importance."⁵³ His willingness to admit industry and commerce to a vital though subordinate role in the national economy placed him again somewhere between Jefferson and Hamilton. In one respect his views presented a striking parallel to those of his fellow Virginian, for like Jefferson he was suspicious of great cities, whose "tumultuous populace" he declared were "ever to be dreaded."⁵⁴

Like so many of the great men of his day, Washington accepted the

⁴⁹ Washington to Sir Edward Newenham, March 2, 1789, *ibid.*, XXX, 217-18.

⁵⁰ Washington to Lafayette, January 29, 1789, *ibid.*, XXX, 186-87.

⁵¹ Richardson (comp.), *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, I, 65.

⁵² Washington to James Anderson, December 24, 1795, in *Writings*, XXXIV, 406.

⁵³ Richardson (comp.), *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, I, 202.

⁵⁴ Washington to Lafayette, July 28, 1791, in *Writings*, XXXI, 324.

idea of progress and hoped that improvements in society might indeed be realized. He distrusted precedents, which he once described as "the arm which first arrests the liberties and happiness of a Country."⁵⁵ To Lafayette he wrote, in 1788, that he loved "to indulge the contemplation of human nature in a progressive state of improvement and melioration";⁵⁶ and a year later he described himself as indulging in "innocent Reveries, that mankind will, one day, grow happier and better."⁵⁷ Perfection, he confessed, was not to be expected in this world;⁵⁸ and after hearing the news from France, early in 1790, he warned a French correspondent against too great an acceleration along the road of improvement.⁵⁹ The same idealism that rejoiced in the probability of progress influenced his thinking upon the problems of war and of peace. On at least one occasion, in 1785, he went so far as to assert that it was his "first wish" that the plague of war should be "banished from off the Earth."⁶⁰ Three years later he expressed interest in a proposal for a universal language, hoping that such a project, if successful, might "one day remove many of the causes of hostility from amongst mankind."⁶¹ Washington was no pacifist; he favored a small peacetime army and he more than once expressed surprise and displeasure that the great maritime powers had not crushed the piratical states on the North African coast. His antipathy to war, however, appears to have been genuine, and presumably it explains in part his later anxiety that this country should avoid a participation in the quarrels of the Old World.

The same cautious humanitarianism which led Washington to deplore the cruelties of war was reflected in his thinking upon some of the other problems of his day. Several times he expressed the hope that the United States would provide "a safe and agreeable Asylum

⁵⁵ Washington to Sir Edward Newenham, November 25, 1785, *ibid.*, XXVIII, 322-23.

⁵⁶ Washington to Lafayette, January 10, 1788, *ibid.*, XXIX, 375.

⁵⁷ Washington to Count Rochambeau, January 29, 1789, *ibid.*, XXX, 189.

⁵⁸ Washington to Lafayette, February 7, 1788, *ibid.*, XXIX, 411.

⁵⁹ Washington to Marquis de la Luzerne, April 29, 1790, *ibid.*, XXXI, 40-41.

⁶⁰ Washington to David Humphreys, July 25, 1785, *ibid.*, XXVIII, 202-203; Washington to Lafayette, July 25, 1785, *ibid.*, XXVIII, 206.

⁶¹ Washington to Lafayette, January 10, 1788, *ibid.*, XXIX, 375.

to the virtuous and persecuted part of mankind."⁶² He likewise indicated his general disapproval of the institution of slavery though he did not favor rash or extra-legal measures to accomplish this desirable end.⁶³ His interest in education is well known, and probably no project was closer to his heart in the closing years of his life than his oft-repeated proposal that a national university should be established in the new capital city.⁶⁴ Such a university, he suggested to Hamilton, should be one in which the young men from all sections of the country would mingle to "receive the polish of Erudition in the Arts, Sciences, and Belles Lettres." The value of a liberal education, however, apparently occupied a secondary place in his thinking. He was disturbed by the danger that young Americans who were educated in Europe might return to their native land with their faith in republican institutions impaired. A national university located in the national capital would provide an appropriate setting for instilling a love of country and an understanding of "the Interests and politics of the Nation." More important, it would serve as a meeting ground for students from every part of the United States, and Washington hoped that these young men would return to their homes convinced that there "was not that cause for those jealousies and prejudices" which then existed in the several sections.⁶⁵ In education as in politics, Washington's thinking was dominated by his intense nationalism and his fear of sectional rivalries.

It was fitting that a thoughtful man intimately concerned with the problems of public life should give some consideration to the purpose

⁶² Washington to Lucretia van Winter, March 30, 1785, *ibid.*, XXVIII, 120; Washington to the Rev. F. A. Vanderkemp, May 28, 1788, *ibid.*, XXIX, 504.

⁶³ Washington to Robert Morris, April 12, 1786, *ibid.*, XXVIII, 408; Washington to Lafayette, April 5, 1783, *ibid.*, XXVI, 300; Washington to Lawrence Lewis, August 4, 1797, *ibid.*, XXXVI, 2.

⁶⁴ Washington to John Adams, November 15, 1794, *ibid.*, XXXIV, 23; Washington to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, January 28, 1795, *ibid.*, XXXIV, 106-107; Washington to Jefferson, March 15, 1795, *ibid.*, XXXIV, 146-47; Washington to Governor Robert Brooke, March 16, 1795, *ibid.*, XXXIV, 149-50; Extract from Washington's Will, July 9, 1799, *ibid.*, XXXVII, 279-80; Eighth Annual Message to Congress, in Richardson (comp.), *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, I, 202.

⁶⁵ Washington to Hamilton, September 1, 1796, in *Writings*, XXXV, 199-200.

of government. A landowner and a creditor, he accepted without question the obligation of government to protect property.⁶⁶ But other considerations influenced his speculations upon this subject. In 1788, he expressed surprise that there was a single king in Europe who failed to recognize that his own reputation rested on "the prosperity and happiness of his People."⁶⁷ In more specific terms, he declared in 1790 that the "aggregate happiness of society . . . is, or ought to be, the end of all government."⁶⁸ This is not to be confused with the inalienable right to "the pursuit of happiness" proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence, for Jefferson referred to the individual while Washington was thinking in terms of society, but "the aggregate happiness of society" was a democratic rather than a Hamiltonian ideal.

In the academic sense of the term, Washington was not a political philosopher. He prepared no treatise on government or politics, and he failed to contribute directly to the extensive pamphlet debates on political issues during the years of his retirement from 1783 to 1789. Yet it is apparent that Washington had given more than casual thought to the fundamental issues of political principle which divided the American people in the years preceding and following the framing of the Constitution. On some issues, such as the competence of the people in political affairs, Washington's views fluctuated with the course of events; on other matters, such as the most desirable basis of the national economy, there was a steady development away from a sole reliance upon agriculture to a recognition of commerce and manufacturing. But through all of his thinking upon political principles ran the major conviction that government must be strong or it is no government worthy of the name. In many respects his views in 1789 appear to have been close to those of Madison, who likewise favored a strong government, and at the beginning of his administration he seems to have had as much respect for and confidence in the political

⁶⁶ Washington to Henry Lee, October 31, 1786, *ibid.*, XXIX, 34.

⁶⁷ Washington to Lafayette, June 19, 1788, *ibid.*, XXIX, 524.

⁶⁸ Washington to Comte de Moustier, November 1, 1790, *ibid.*, XXXI, 142.

views of Madison as he had for the ideas of any other important public figure.

The memory of an old man is a notoriously treacherous guide for the historian. It provides, however, a brief postscript to this study. In 1813, Jefferson recalled the political conflicts of Washington's administration, but exonerated Washington of the charge that he had held Federalist views. On the contrary, declared Jefferson, "General Washington did not harbor one principle of federalism." The "only point on which he and I ever differed in opinion," continued Jefferson, "was, that I had more confidence than he had in the natural integrity and discretion of the people, and in the safety and extent to which they might trust themselves with a control over their government."⁶⁹ Jefferson's recollections appear to have been more interesting than accurate. Washington did hold at least one principle of federalism—belief in strong government—and it was on that point that his thinking had been clear and consistent for many years. The growing breach between Washington and Jefferson, after 1790, apparently developed primarily because Washington was persuaded to place the strengthening of the central government above all other considerations and only incidentally because of differences of opinion as to the wisdom and virtue of the people. Whether the ease with which Washington was persuaded to accept a program for increasing the power of the central government was the result of the "fatal . . . influence" of Hamilton over Washington, as John Adams suggested,⁷⁰ or whether it arose primarily from the strength of the convictions which Washington had developed during and after the Revolution must be left to the speculation of any who may wish to make a more intensive study of this question.

⁶⁹ Jefferson to John Melish, January 13, 1813, in *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, Monticello edition, 20 vols. (Washington, 1904), XIII, 212.

⁷⁰ Adams to Jefferson, July, 1813, and July 22, 1813, *ibid.*, XIII, 301, 323.

Propaganda in the Confederacy

BY JAMES W. SILVER¹

In 1924 the late Charles W. Ramsdell read before the annual meeting of the American Historical Association, at Richmond, Virginia, a paper entitled "The Problem of Public Morale in the Southern Confederacy."² In the two decades since that meeting it has been convincingly demonstrated that the Confederacy fell because of internal conditions as well as from external pressure.³ It is not the design of this paper, therefore, to compile again the causes of disintegration within the southern states nor to retrace the gradual breakdown in public morale from the almost universal enthusiasm prevailing in 1861 to the dark days of defeatism toward the close of the war.

For the first point we would need remind ourselves only of the hard facts of conscription, impressment, and taxes-in-kind, of the weakness of the southern financial structure with its attendant evils of inflation, speculation, hoarding, extortion, and trading with the enemy, of the feeling of the masses that they were being discriminated against, of the scarcity of everything from cotton cards to railroad engines, of

¹ Research for this paper was made possible by a grant-in-aid from the Southern Regional Committee of the Social Science Research Council for the summer of 1942. The paper was read before a meeting of the Southern Historical Association, in Nashville, Tennessee, on November 3, 1944.

² See American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1924 (Washington, 1929), 49. Professor Ramsdell's paper was never published, but the writer possesses a photostatic copy. It was concerned mainly with the problem of public morale, with the reasons for and the evidences of the breakdown which came after 1862. The present paper has to do with the efforts to bolster public morale in the Confederacy.

³ Ella Lonn, *Desertion during the Civil War* (New York, 1928); Albert B. Moore, *Conscription and Conflict in the Confederacy* (New York, 1924); Georgia L. Tatum, *Disloyalty in the Confederacy* (Chapel Hill, 1934); Frank L. Owsley, *State Rights in the Confederacy* (Chicago, 1925).

constant bickering among the military and civil leaders, of the gnawing fears of soldiers and civilians for the safety and even the existence of their friends and family and property, of the devastation of invading armies, and of the war weariness which inevitably accompanies military reverses. If Professor Owsley were to rewrite his volume today he might rephrase his symbolical epitaph: "Died of State Rights—and other internal complications."⁴

For the second point, it would suffice to note that more than a year before Appomattox a leading editor, acknowledging that the material and human resources of the Confederacy were still adequate, wrote that "the country may soon suffer from moral exhaustion. . . . There is such a thing possible as a decay of national confidence and a death of national spirit . . . hopelessness and despair, lethargy and apathy."⁵ And, as early as September, 1864, Governor Zebulon B. Vance had written in words of anguish of "the utter demoralization of the people. With a base line of communication of 500 miles in Sherman's rear, through our own country, not a bridge has been burnt, a car thrown from its track, nor a man shot by the people whose country he has desolated! They seem everywhere to submit. . . . It shows what I have always believed, that the great *popular heart* is not now and never has been in this war! It was a revolution of the *politicians*, not the *people*."⁶

As Professor Ramsdell well demonstrated: "The southern people . . . were able to build an effective military machine, as far as the fighting qualities were concerned, but . . . *they failed completely to solve the problem of preserving the well-being and the morale of the civilian population*. . . . The courage of the men in the ranks and the skill of their officers were nullified by the collapse of the economic resources and the morale of the people behind the battle front. . . . The failure to provide for them was fatal."⁷ It is the purpose of this paper to

⁴ Owsley, *State Rights in the Confederacy*, 1.

⁵ John M. Daniel, in *Richmond Examiner*, December 29, 1863.

⁶ Quoted in Ramsdell, "The Problem of Public Morale in the Southern Confederacy," 18.

⁷ Charles W. Ramsdell, *Behind the Lines in the Southern Confederacy* (Baton Rouge, 1944), 2, 83.

sketch the efforts made to influence public opinion and to bolster civilian morale within the Confederacy.

Government surveillance over domestic public opinion, with which we are thoroughly familiar in the wars of the twentieth century, seems to have been almost non-existent during the Civil War.⁸ As far as the writer can discover, there was no centralized, systematic attempt to formulate public opinion on either side, and the lethargic Confederate Congress never interfered with executive control to the extent of the formation of a "Committee on the Conduct of the War." It did, however, on occasion request President Jefferson Davis to correct misinformation which was widespread among the people, and several times it sought to heighten flagging public sentiment by means of stirring appeals direct to the nation.⁹ These appeals were extensively carried by the press, and Congress ordered the printing of forty thousand copies of at least one of them.¹⁰ This does not mean that in Richmond the significance of civilian morale was overlooked; on the contrary, it seems ever to have been in the minds of the President and his advisers. Davis himself worked diligently to arouse a militant spirit among the people. His messages to Congress and his numerous proclamations were meticulously written with an eye to their propaganda value.¹¹ The President used his superior oratorical ability on every possible occasion; aside from his triumphal tours to Montgomery and Richmond, he made three extended speaking journeys throughout that part of the

⁸ James G. Randall, *The Civil War and Reconstruction* (Boston, 1937), 636.

⁹ Joint Resolutions: April 4, 1863, in *War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, 129 vols. and index (Washington, 1880-1901), Ser. IV, Vol. II, p. 468; January 22, 1864, *ibid.*, Ser. IV, Vol. III, pp. 126-27; February 17, 1864, *ibid.*, 139-40; March 14, 1865, in Charles W. Ramsdell (ed.), *Laws and Joint Resolutions of the Last Session of the Confederate Congress* (Durham, 1941), 134-35.

¹⁰ *Official Records*, Ser. IV, Vol. III, pp. 139-40.

¹¹ See, for example, Davis to Congress, April 29, 1861, and November 18, 1861, in Dunbar Rowland (ed.), *Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist: His Letters, Papers, and Speeches*, 10 vols. (Jackson, 1923), V, 83-84, 166-69; and of January 12, 1863, in *Official Records*, Ser. IV, Vol. II, pp. 475-77. His "Address to the Soldiers of the Confederate States," perhaps inspired by Lee, received almost universal editorial approval and was carried by the southern press for twenty days at government expense. *Mobile Register and Advertiser*, August 9, 1863; Lonn, *Desertion during the Civil War*, 49.

Confederacy east of the Mississippi River.¹² There appears to be no doubt of the tremendous appeal of a personal appearance of the President in any section.¹³

Regardless of the highly publicized dispute between Davis and the governors of North Carolina and Georgia, the President was solicitous of the support of all state executives and he strove to influence the people through them.¹⁴ Fearful of a resentful public opinion, he was slow to exercise his power to declare martial law and to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.¹⁵ He sought to win the good will of people in invaded areas.¹⁶ From time to time the President called for days of fasting, humiliation, and prayer.¹⁷ These proclamations were regarded by one critic "as either cant or mental weakness. When we find the President in a corner telling his beads, and relying upon a miracle to save the country . . . the effect is distressing in the extreme."¹⁸ Like Lincoln, Davis often used the instrument of a simple, homely letter to an individual who had performed some peculiar service for the

¹² His first swing around the circle (December, 1862-January, 1863) was largely concerned with public morale, while the other two (October-November, 1863, and September-October, 1864) were dictated also by extremely delicate military situations.

¹³ William E. Dodd, *Jefferson Davis* (Philadelphia, 1907), 297; Moore, *Conscription and Conflict*, 143-44; Rowland (ed.), *Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist*, V, 386; VI, 57-58, 61-62; John B. Jones, *A Rebel War Clerk's Diary*, 2 vols. (edited by Howard Swiggett, New York, 1935), II, 76, 89-90, 283; *Mobile Register and Advertiser*, December 14, 1862. The opposition press did not spare Davis. The *Richmond Whig*, October 12, 1863, reminded its readers that Davis had visited Manassas in 1861 and Mississippi before Vicksburg fell. It was not certain that he had prevented pursuit of McDowell, nor was it sure "that President Davis' visits invariably produce a paralysis in military operations. . . . He has never yet been accused of willfully preventing his armies from whipping the enemy."

¹⁴ Davis to Joseph E. Brown, May 29, July 10, 1862, in Rowland (ed.), *Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist*, V, 255-62, 292-93; Davis to John J. Pettus, November 26, 1862, and to Charles Clark, December 28, 1863, in Mississippi Department of Archives and History; Ramsdell, *Behind the Lines in the Confederacy*, 115.

¹⁵ Davis to Pettus, August 4, 1862, to John C. Pemberton, August 4, 1862, and to Francis W. Pickens, August 5, 1862, in Rowland (ed.), *Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist*, V, 309-12.

¹⁶ Davis to Robert E. Lee, Braxton Bragg, and E. Kirby Smith, September 7, 1862, *ibid.*, V, 338-39.

¹⁷ *Natchez Daily Courier*, June 1, 1861; Jones, *Rebel War Clerk's Diary*, I, 280; II, 321-22, 401; *Official Records*, Ser. IV, Vol. III, p. 1037.

¹⁸ *Richmond Examiner*, May 19, 1862.

Confederacy,¹⁹ and occasionally he or some associate revised articles for the press²⁰ and inspired morale-boosting mass meetings throughout the South.²¹ Such propaganda pressure from the seat of the government seems to have been the hit-or-miss efforts of vigilant individuals rather than the planned program of a committee or department.

The most obvious propaganda device of the state governments was the governor's proclamation, which might take any form from a dignified defense of secession to the use of atrocity stories to highlight emotional predictions as to the fate of the Confederacy if its people did not respond to patriotic appeals.²² It is impossible to evaluate the degree to which morale was involved in the multifarious activities of the states. Some present-day southern apostles of laissez faire and "Jeffersonian" free enterprise would be amazed to discover the extent of state socialism contrived in emergency by their ancestors. "Considerations of policy as well as humanity"²³ doubtless inspired state

¹⁹ Davis to Mrs. Sarah Cochrane (who had offered her silver plate to the government to be coined into money), June 5, 1862, in Rowland (ed.), *Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist*, V, 269; to Mrs. Mary Wilkinson, November 7, 1862, *ibid.*, 365; to J. W. Harmon, September 17, 1863, in *Official Records*, Ser. IV, Vol. II, pp. 809-10.

²⁰ Davis to John Forsyth, February 21, 1865, in *Official Records*, Ser. IV, Vol. III, p. 1110; Jones, *Rebel War Clerk's Diary*, I, 55; II, 63-64.

²¹ Jones, *Rebel War Clerk's Diary*, I, 81, 163, 171; II, 410; Judah P. Benjamin to Fred A. Porcher, December 21, 1864, in *Official Records*, Ser. IV, Vol. III, p. 959; James A. Seddon to Herschel V. Johnson and Benjamin H. Hill, September 5, 1864, *ibid.*, 3, 621; *Charleston Mercury*, August 6, 1863; *Montgomery Weekly Mail*, August 5, 1863; George W. Randolph to governors, July 17, 1862, in *Official Records*, Ser. IV, Vol. II, p. 7; Randolph to John G. Shorter, October 2, 1862, *ibid.*, 106.

²² Proclamations of Joseph E. Brown, February 11, 1862, January 17, September 5, 1863, in *Official Records*, Ser. IV, Vol. I, p. 918; Ser. IV, Vol. II, pp. 360-61, 789-90; of John G. Shorter, March 12, 1862, March 25, 1863, in *Mobile Register and Advertiser*, and *Montgomery Weekly Mail*; of John Milton, August 12, 1862, in *Official Records*, Ser. IV, Vol. II, pp. 49-50; and of Zebulon B. Vance, May 11, September 7, 1863, in Lonn, *Desertion during the Civil War*, 109-11, and in *Official Records*, Ser. IV, Vol. II, pp. 794-96. The bitter feud between Davis and Vance has overshadowed the great contributions of the governors to the war effort, and has perhaps lessened the attention paid to the unswerving loyalty of such state executives as Henry W. Allen, of Louisiana. Richard E. Yates, "Zebulon B. Vance as War Governor of North Carolina, 1862-1865," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), III (1937), 43-75; Jefferson D. Bragg, *Louisiana in the Confederacy* (Baton Rouge, 1941). For attempts of the Alabama legislature to control public opinion, see Walter L. Fleming, *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama* (New York, 1905), 131-33, 134-35, 202.

²³ Ramsdell, *Behind the Lines in the Confederacy*, 40.

control of agricultural production, price regulation, restraint of desertion and disloyalty, prohibition, manufacturing, and foreign trade.²⁴ In the matter of relief, the states were forced by necessity to assist the notable efforts of local communities to provide for their destitute population. Justice and humanity urged such action, but it was also dictated by the knowledge that a breakdown in public morale would be fatal. Private relief—the Mobile Relief Association was supplying 1,800 persons a day as early as October, 1861,²⁵—led, by 1862, to appropriations of millions of dollars by the states. Before the end of the war, relief allotments reached large proportions and many states had come to selling goods at cost, to dispensing free such articles as salt, grain, medicines, cotton cards, and clothing, and to suspending taxes and impressments.²⁶ The whole program was only partially successful, because of mishandling, favoritism, speculation, red tape, and the lack of central direction.²⁷

Not only did high military officials issue proclamations and addresses designed to bolster civilian morale,²⁸ but it was not uncommon for the soldiers in the field to issue memorials for the same purpose.²⁹

In February, 1865, General Robert E. Lee wrote Governor Vance: "I think some good can be accomplished by the efforts of influential citizens to change public sentiment. . . . If they would explain . . . that the cause is not hopeless . . . I think our sorely tried people would be induced to make one more effort."³⁰ For four years prominent civilians had addressed mass meetings in all parts of the Confederacy, and the

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 40-41, 68-76, 115; Tatum, *Disloyalty in the Confederacy*, 42; Lonn, *Desertion during the Civil War*, 112-13; Louise B. Hill, *State Socialism in the Confederate States of America (Southern Sketches, No. 9, Charlottesville, 1936)*; Charles W. Ramsdell, "The Control of Manufacturing by the Confederate Government," in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1914-), VIII (1921-1922), 231-50.

²⁵ *Mobile Register and Advertiser*, October 29, 1861.

²⁶ Ramsdell, *Behind the Lines in the Confederacy*, 61-68, 89-91; Bell I. Wiley, *The Plain People of the Confederacy* (Baton Rouge, 1943), 42; Fleming, *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama*, 198-99.

²⁷ Wiley, *Plain People of the Confederacy*, 43.

²⁸ Jackson *Daily Mississippian*, July 15, 1862; *Official Records*, Ser. IV, Vol. III, p. 6; Lonn, *Desertion during the Civil War*, 46-47.

²⁹ Richmond *Whig*, September 5, 1863.

³⁰ *Official Records*, Ser. I, Vol. XLVII, Part 2, p. 1270.

words of William L. Yancey, Benjamin H. Hill, Robert M. T. Hunter, Alexander H. Stephens, Howell Cobb, and a host of others, had not fallen upon deaf ears.³¹ Even today one reads with emotion the impassioned plea of Lucius Q. C. Lamar before an Atlanta audience in April, 1864.³² Such addresses were widely copied in the press as well as distributed in pamphlet form.³³

No institution was more influential, North and South, in the maintenance of morale, than the church. Andrew Johnson, having passed five preachers through the Confederate lines in June, 1862, wrote: "These assumed ministers of Christ have done more to poison and corrupt the female mind of this community than all others, in fact, changing their entire character from that of women and ladies to that of fanatics and fiends. One of these very ministers . . . told those who were collected to see him off: 'Don't forget God, Jeff Davis and the Confederacy.'"³⁴ Ministers preached innumerable sermons directed not only against the Devil, "who is perhaps the strongest ally of the Yankees,"³⁵ but also against draft evaders, extortioners, and backsliders in general.³⁶ These discourses must have been distributed by the thousands in printed form to soldiers³⁷ and civilians under the belief

³¹ Charleston *Mercury*, March 11, 1862; *Montgomery Weekly Mail*, May 10, 1862, February 9, 1864; Jones, *Rebel War Clerk's Diary*, II, 411, 414-15; Moore, *Conscription and Conflict*, 158-60.

³² Curry pamphlets, in Alabama Department of Archives and History. This collection of Civil War pamphlets was made by Jabez L. M. Curry.

³³ Addresses of Robert H. Smith, March 30, 1861, and James B. Owens, January 6, 1861, Curry pamphlets, Alabama Department of Archives and History; see also "An Appeal from the Daughters of New Orleans," which implored the people to avenge their wrongs even at the cost of life itself. These ladies were of the opinion that it would "have been better for New Orleans to have been laid in ruins, and we buried beneath the mass, than that we should be subjected to these untold sufferings." Charleston *Mercury*, June 11, 1862.

³⁴ Lloyd P. Stryker, *Andrew Johnson: A Study in Courage* (New York, 1929), 98-99.

³⁵ Quoted in Moore, *Conscription and Conflict*, 58-59.

³⁶ Charleston *Mercury*, August 1, 1863; *Montgomery Weekly Mail*, September 2, 1863; Curry pamphlets; Lonn, *Desertion during the Civil War*, 59; Fleming, *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama*, 222-25.

³⁷ The Evangelical Tract Society alone was credited with sending 26,000,000 pamphlets to the army by October, 1863, and new religious publishing houses sprang into existence to meet the demand. *Mobile Register and Advertiser*, October 20, 1863; Richmond *Enquirer*, August 2, 1862; Yates Snowden, *War Time Publications from the Press of Walker, Evans and Cogswell Co.* (Charleston, 1922).

that, as expressed by the Reverend Henry Tucker, "the spread of the sentiments in my discourse will not only do good to the hearts of my countrymen, but contribute to our success in the struggle in which we are engaged. . . . We are certain of success in this war if we but use the right means. . . . Gather together the implements of war and prepare for battle. . . . To lay them aside would tempt God's providence."³⁸ On May 5, 1861, the Southern Baptist Convention, to mention only one of many similar bodies, assured Davis "that we will assiduously invoke the Divine direction and favor in behalf of those who bear rule among us."³⁹

The schoolroom as an instrument for building morale was not overlooked in the Confederacy. A conference of North Carolina schoolteachers addressed the people of the state in 1861 with a plea to keep open the common schools and a pledge to use them for propaganda purposes. A year later the state superintendent of common schools was able to report: "It has been my effort . . . to observe every phase of public opinion—to meet promptly the many dangerous vagaries or sentiments so likely to be started up in such a mighty shock. . . . Our system has already done much to infuse life and patriotism into the masses."⁴⁰ He urged county board chairmen "to exert yourselves to diffuse correct information as to the condition of affairs . . . in stimulating all classes to vie with each other in promoting the honor, independence and prosperity . . . of the Confederate States." Similar thoughts seem to have been in the minds of those teachers from every part of the Confederacy who assembled at Columbia, South Carolina, in April, 1863. The schoolroom was to be used as a place "to endeavor to lead the public mind . . . to just views in regard to the true elements of national strength."⁴¹

³⁸ Curry pamphlets.

³⁹ *Proceedings of the Southern Baptist Convention at its Eighth Biennial Session. . . May 10-13, 1861*, in Curry pamphlets. The Convention recognized "the necessity that the whole morale influence of the people . . . should be enlisted in the aid of the rulers."

⁴⁰ *Report of the Superintendent of Common Schools of North Carolina for the Year 1862* (Raleigh, 1862).

⁴¹ *Proceedings of the Convention of Teachers of the Confederate States*, in Curry pamphlets.

The extent of publication of Confederate textbooks is amazing.⁴² Between four and five hundred are extant, and editions of ten, twenty, and thirty thousand copies were common.⁴³ The spellers, the language books, and some readers contained little propaganda.⁴⁴ But a study of Mrs. M. B. Moore's *Primary Geography* will bring to light some novel information on slavery, the northern states, and the future of the Confederacy. The United States, once prosperous, is now "tumbling into ruins because of injustice and avarice of the Yankee Nation." In the questions and answers department, we find: "Q. What is the present drawback to our trade? A. An unlawful blockade by the miserable and hellish Yankee Nation."⁴⁵ General Daniel H. Hill's *Elements of Algebra* was commended by the *Mobile Register and Advertiser* for impressing upon students "a proper estimate of Yankee character."⁴⁶ Some of its problems began: "A Yankee mixes a certain quantity of wooden nutmegs, which cost him one-fourth cent apiece, with a quantity of real nutmegs, worth four cents apiece. . . ." "The field of battle of Buena Vista is six and a half miles from Saltillo. Two Indiana volunteers ran away from the field of battle at the same time. . . ."⁴⁷ These examples are at least more subtle than the much-

⁴² Many magazine and newspaper editors were concerned about the crying need for southern textbooks. *De Bow's Review* (New Orleans, 1846-1880), XXX (1861), 608-12; *Mobile Register and Advertiser*, July 11, September 12, October 30, 1861. The *Richmond Whig*, July 25, 1863, was tired of "Yankee clap-trap. . . . If we begin by spelling 'centre', 'center', we shall end by pronouncing 'dew', 'doo'." It wanted a new language, and new weights and measures.

⁴³ Stephen B. Weeks, "Confederate Text-Books (1861-1865); A Preliminary Bibliography," in *Report of the Commissioner of Education* [1898-1899], 2 vols. (Washington, 1900), I, 1139-55. About forty Confederate textbooks may be found in the United States Office of Education, Washington, D. C. *The Southern Primer, for Schools and Families*, was reported as having been printed in thirty thousand copies. *Richmond Whig*, June 24, 1864.

⁴⁴ This conclusion was reached after a study of nearly one hundred Confederate textbooks.

⁴⁵ Mrs. M. B. Moore, *Primary Geography, Arranged as a Reading Book for Common Schools, with Questions and Answers Attached* (2nd edition, Raleigh, 1864), 13, 40, 47.

⁴⁶ January 9, 1863.

⁴⁷ Frank Moore, *Anecdotes, Poetry, and Incidents of the War* (New York, 1867), 47. Another problem began: "The year in which Decatur published his official letter from New London, stating that the traitors of New England burned blue lights on both points of the harbor to give notice to the British of his attempt to go to sea, is expressed by four digits. The sum of the first and fourth. . . ."

quoted ability of the average Southerner to whip from seven to ninety Yankees.⁴⁸

It is impossible here to do more than suggest the propaganda possibilities in the flood of almanacs, biographies, political miscellany, magazines, theatrical plays, religious publications, contemporary history, song books, music, literary works, pamphlets of all kinds, and even cook books, which streamed from the Confederate press.⁴⁹ One or two excerpts from *The Confederate States Almanac, and Repository of Useful Knowledge* for 1862 will indicate its possibilities:

August 25. Commencement of the Reign of Terror throughout the Northern States.

November 30. . . . the last remnants of the Old Federal Union are preparing their final efforts . . . to crush our young giant Confederacy.

The real ultra abolitionists . . . comprise the larger body of the people of the North. . . . The abolitionist is a practical atheist.

The same spirit which, in the days of Robespierre and Marat, abolished the Lord's Day and worshipped Reason, in the person of a harlot, yet survives to work other horrors.⁵⁰

It is likely that the *Confederate Receipt Book*, which explains how to make "a splendid cup of coffee" from ripe acorns,⁵¹ sprang from the exigencies of the time, and it also seems probable that the multitude of Confederate songs and poems were the product of war psychology. Few issues of any newspaper appeared without at least one song or poem,⁵² and, as the Richmond *Enquirer* pointed out, they "contain a wealth of patriotic sentiment that cannot fail to animate the whole country."⁵³ With the exception of a limited number composed by a Timrod or a Hayne, they should have been suppressed at birth. A few lines will illustrate the writer's point:

⁴⁸ Wiley, *Plain People of the Confederacy*, 56-57.

⁴⁹ *De Bow's Review* is filled with such articles as "The State of the Country," "The Right of Secession," "Negro Freedom an Impossibility under Nature's Laws," and "Our Danger and Our Duty," all advocating support of the Confederate cause.

⁵⁰ H. C. Clarke, *The Confederate States Almanac, and Repository of Useful Knowledge, for the Year 1862* (Vicksburg, 1862), 98, 104, 123-24.

⁵¹ *Confederate Receipt Book: A Compendium of over One Hundred Receipts, Adapted to the Times* (Richmond, 1863), 17.

⁵² Thomas C. DeLeon had collected more than nineteen hundred Confederate poems before his *South Songs* went to press. *Four Years in Rebel Capitals* (Mobile, 1890), 295.

⁵³ May 21, 1862.

And if there be one base spirit who stands
 Now, in our peril, with folded hands,
 Let his grave at once in the soil be wrought,
 With the sword with which his old father fought.

Where my home was glad, are ashes,
 And horror and shame had been there—
 For I found, on the fallen lintel,
 This tress of my wife's torn hair.⁵⁴

Southern newspapers in general excelled their northern rivals in the furtherance of their respective causes.⁵⁵ By no means does this imply a shackled press or one that uniformly supported the government, as even a hasty perusal of the files of the *Charleston Mercury*, or the *Richmond Whig* and the *Richmond Examiner* will indicate.⁵⁶ Confederate editors clamored continuously for the freedom of the press (especially when it came to the conscription of editors) and repeatedly confessed that they had done more to support the war than any other group except the army itself.⁵⁷ The principal restrictions

⁵⁴ William Gilmore Simms (comp.), *War Poetry of the South* (New York, 1867), 31, 147.

⁵⁵ James G. Randall, "The Newspaper Problem in Its Bearing upon Military Secrecy during the Civil War," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XXIII (1917-1918), 314-16.

⁵⁶ An editorial claiming that Lee's army was worse than McClellan's when it came to plundering (*Richmond Whig*, March 30, 1863) and a reporter's findings that Bragg's army in Middle Tennessee was "completely demoralized" (*Mobile Register and Advertiser*, May 26, 1863) do not indicate censorship. For repeated criticism of Confederate generals, see *Charleston Mercury*, July 7, 8, 1862, May 13, 1863. The *Mercury* often spoke of Davis as that "vast complication of incompetence and folly." See, for example, the issues of March 22, 25, 1862, July 28, 1862, November 21, 1864. According to the *Richmond Examiner*, December 1, 1863, "If after Manassas, Johnston and Beauregard had written briefly thus: Glory to God and Davis, Bull Run's ours—they would have been wise, and might have rendered their country many services since, which they have not had the means of doing."

One pro-administration paper wanted "critical censure reserved . . . till its practice is less dangerous to the public cause." *Mobile Register and Advertiser*, October 24, 1861. The *Montgomery Weekly Mail*, November 25, 1863, thought that Albert Sidney Johnston had "voluntarily sacrificed his life" at Shiloh because of undeserved censure. It also contended that this "eternal gabble about the rights of the people, usurpations of government, unconstitutional measures . . . has been the breath of life to fools and demagogues." *Ibid.*, October 18, 1862. Aspersions on the President, according to the *Richmond Examiner*, March 7, 1862, were "unjust . . . ill timed, unpatriotic and mischievous." And so the squabbles continued to the end of the war.

⁵⁷ *Charleston Mercury*, November 4, 1864; *Mobile Register and Advertiser*, May 24,

seem to have been imposed on correspondents in the field.⁵⁸ Lee, Beauregard, Bragg, Van Dorn, and Hood, to mention only a few, at times excluded reporters from their armies.⁵⁹ In the spring of 1862 the provost marshal threatened to muzzle the *Mobile Tribune* if communications from the army in Corinth were published.⁶⁰ Such action, however, was the exception.

It became the custom of southern papers to withhold, voluntarily and sometimes in conjunction with the government, information which might be of help to the enemy.⁶¹ On one memorable occasion Lee's strategy was based upon General George B. McClellan's acceptance of false information which the Confederate general had requested the Richmond papers to publish.⁶² News of the famous Richmond bread riot of April, 1862, did not appear in the local press until copied from northern papers, and then it was belittled as Union propaganda.⁶³ On the other hand, General Thomas J. Jackson once found an account of an intended secret march printed in a Baltimore paper before he was halfway to his objective,⁶⁴ and Davis himself was responsible in 1864 for an indiscretion which allowed Sherman to discover, through newspaper accounts of his Macon speech, the military plans of the govern-

November 17, 1863; *Richmond Examiner*, February 3, 1862; *Montgomery Daily Mail*, September 26, 1862; Moore, *Conscription and Conflict*, 66.

⁵⁸ A bill was reported by the House Military Committee "to prevent information of the plans and operations of the land and naval forces of the Confederate States being conveyed to the enemy," and carrying penalties of fine and imprisonment. *Charleston Mercury*, January 18, 1862. Davis himself asked for a three-year control of the press in 1864. *Ibid.*, November 14, 1864. Some papers were suppressed for short periods or their editors arrested for attempting to array the planters against the government. *Mobile Register and Advertiser*, April 30, 1862. See also, James W. Patton, *Unionism and Reconstruction in Tennessee* (Chapel Hill, 1934), 35.

⁵⁹ *Charleston Mercury*, May 27, August 13, 26, 1862, September 30, 1863, October 19, 1864; *Mobile Register and Advertiser*, May 29, 1862; *Richmond Enquirer*, July 14, 1862.

⁶⁰ *Montgomery Weekly Mail*, July 23, 1863.

⁶¹ *Mobile Register and Advertiser*, October 9, 1861, March 18, 1862, June 24, 1863; *Richmond Enquirer*, February 8, September 24, 1862; *Charleston Mercury*, July 29, 1863, October 12, 1864; Jones, *Rebel War Clerk's Diary*, I, 89, 267, 329; II, 27, 71, 146, 211, 268, 301, 303, 318, 383, 434-35.

⁶² Randall, "Newspaper Problem during the Civil War," *loc. cit.*, 314-15.

⁶³ *Richmond Whig*, April 6, 1862; Jones, *Rebel War Clerk's Diary*, I, 285-86; Ramsdell, *Behind the Lines in the Confederacy*, 49-50.

⁶⁴ Jones, *Rebel War Clerk's Diary*, I, 104.

ment.⁶⁵ The Richmond *Whig* thought the papers in the Southwest should be more discreet: "A little time should be given the Yankee commander some chance to display his sagacity. It is not fair or courteous to thrust information upon him before he has had an opportunity to obtain it by his own agencies."⁶⁶

Most of the slight news distortion found in southern papers was the natural exaggeration of editors who wishfully misinterpreted reports which at best were extremely unreliable.⁶⁷ It was claimed that the people would soon "begin to regard telegraphic dispatches with almost as much distrust as they would an abolition editor's sworn statement."⁶⁸ The Jackson (Mississippi) press association representative who had ten thousand Yankees killed one day only to bring them back to life the next, and who talked of the possibility of the "total annihilation" of Grant's forces just before the fall of Vicksburg, was thought "the most credulous man alive."⁶⁹ Occasionally the headlines of a journal ran: "News By Telegraph—Hopeful if True."⁷⁰ The report of General William T. Sherman's death,⁷¹ the story of the capture of Cincinnati,⁷² and rumors of poisoned bullets⁷³ and tremendous enemy losses,⁷⁴ were indications of a willingness to believe. Yet, on Monday, April 7, 1862, the *Mobile Register and Advertiser*, in an extra edition, proclaimed a brilliant Confederate victory for the first day of Shiloh, but no mention was made of Monday's fighting until Friday, when it was admitted that the Confederate army had retired to Corinth.⁷⁵ Lee's invasions of

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, II, 293; Randall, "Newspaper Problem during the Civil War," *loc. cit.*, 315-16; Charleston *Mercury*, September 27, 1864.

⁶⁶ May 27, 1863.

⁶⁷ Richmond *Examiner*, July 15, 1863.

⁶⁸ *Mobile Register and Advertiser*, September 9, 1862; Charleston *Mercury*, December 10, 1862. There had been established a "Press Association of the Confederate States." *Minutes of the Board of Directors* (Atlanta, 1864).

⁶⁹ Montgomery *Weekly Mail*, July 8, 1863.

⁷⁰ *Mobile Register and Advertiser*, June 21, 1861, April 16, 1862.

⁷¹ Houston *Telegraph*, April 17, 1862.

⁷² *Mobile Register and Advertiser*, September 9, 1862.

⁷³ Memphis *Appeal*, April 14, 1862; Richmond *Whig*, September 16, 1863.

⁷⁴ Natchez *Courier*, July 24, 1861; Jones, *Rebel War Clerk's Diary*, I, 91, 323.

⁷⁵ *Mobile Register and Advertiser*, April 7-12, 1862. See also, Charleston *Mercury*, April 10-14, 1862.

Maryland and Pennsylvania were first heralded as glorious successes, and later Antietam and Gettysburg became "defensive victories."⁷⁶ News copied from northern papers was carefully selected but, generally speaking, the southern press was guilty of only slight distortion of military news.⁷⁷

The Richmond *Whig* in 1863 demanded that every newspaper in the South devote all space possible to calling for retaliation for "the groans of aged men, the shrieks of violated women, the cries of orphaned children, the dying sighs of Confederate prisoners slaughtered in cold blood, the crashing of burning farm houses and the complaints of butchered milch cattle."⁷⁸ Atrocity-wise editors repeatedly called attention to the "premeditated massacre and pillage" and the "carnage and conflagration" connived at by northern generals, who permitted "brutal soldiery, drunken with wine, blood and fury . . . to enter every dwelling at their pleasure, plunder the property, ravish the women, burn the house, and proceed to the next."⁷⁹ Sherman's troops came in for special censure. According to the *Augusta Register*: "We are informed that the incarnate devils ravished some of the nicest ladies of the town" of Milledgeville.⁸⁰

Southern prisoners of war, according to the papers, were poisoned,

⁷⁶ Richmond *Enquirer*, September 23, 1862; Charleston *Mercury*, September 23, 1862, July 9-16, 1863; Richmond *Whig*, July 6, 1863. According to the *Montgomery Weekly Mail* of July 22, 1863, "Lee's purpose seems to have been simply to forage on the enemy, and in this he has been successful, for he has gathered a large quantity of provisions, and any amount of horses." Later in the war small engagements were likely to be played up as "Glorious News from the West," and "Brilliant Victory in Mississippi." See, for example, Charleston *Mercury*, May 9-10, December 27, 1864.

⁷⁷ Charleston *Mercury*, June 25, 1864. See also, Fleming, *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama*, 218-20.

⁷⁸ May 21, 1863.

⁷⁹ Richmond *Examiner*, March 7, 1864. The Charleston *Mercury*, June 24, 1864, claimed that a Mrs. Corry, stripped of every means of subsistence, went to General Warren for permission to buy a little of her own food "to feed her two sick and starving children." "We have nothing for sale," replied the general. "Then," said the half frantic woman, "I will beg; give me, for God's sake, a meal of meat for my two sick children." "Madame," replied the general, "we read that during the siege of Jerusalem, women were reduced to eat their children." Another report stated that when a woman, within enemy lines, applied for a pass to Richmond, the answer from Grant was: "You are better where you are. When I enter Richmond, women's persons will not be safe."

⁸⁰ December 2, 1864, quoted in Charleston *Mercury*, December 7, 1864.

starved, frozen to death, stripped of all clothing, had their hands and feet cut off, were deliberately infected with smallpox, and were often shot in cold blood.⁸¹ In general the degree of atrocity seemed to vary in inverse ratio with the fortunes of the Confederacy.

Up to the very hour of the evacuation of Richmond, newspapers appeared as confident as ever.⁸² The superiority of southern fighting ability, of southern resources, patriotism, and vigilance was always assumed.⁸³ At the same time that the Union soldier was belittled, the dissension and disaffection in his section were magnified many times over. Bankruptcy, internal strife, foreign war, and general despondency were prophesied for the "Saints of Sodom, the Yankees."⁸⁴ Their military and civil leaders were caricatured and ridiculed beyond recognition. The *Mobile Register and Advertiser* spoke of the President of the United States as Abraham Hanks,⁸⁵ and the description of Benjamin F. Butler as "the paragon and darling of that horny, whipcord breed of women who supply inmates for all the brothels of the continent"⁸⁶ was mild indeed.

An occasional glorification of war itself accompanied the exhortatory appeals which attempted to force into line any individuals who were lukewarm in their sympathy with the cause.⁸⁷ According to the *Charleston Mercury*, "A terrified man is often the bravest in announcing his fear. . . . Stop him—face him—rebuke him—knock him down if necessary, but do not let him . . . poison a whole people with his fears."⁸⁸

⁸¹ *Charleston Mercury*, October 8, 1861; *Montgomery Weekly Mail*, April 8, September 26, 1862, April 29, 1863; *Mobile Register and Advertiser*, May 29, 1863; *Richmond Whig*, August 12, 1863; *Richmond Examiner*, March 17, 1864.

⁸² George C. Eggleston, *A Rebel's Recollections* (New York, 1878), 232-33.

⁸³ *Richmond Examiner*, September 27, November 29, 1861; *Jackson Daily Mississippian*, April 21, 1863; *Richmond Whig*, November-December, 1863. The *New Orleans Crescent*, remarking the calling out of eight thousand Massachusetts militia, added that if they would come down to Pensacola, eighteen hundred Confederates would easily "whip them out." Albert D. Richardson, *The Secret Service, the Dungeon, and the Escape* (Hartford, 1866), 90.

⁸⁴ *Charleston Mercury*, January 15, 1862, November 18, 1863; Jones, *Rebel War Clerk's Diary*, I, 351-52, 363-64.

⁸⁵ May 29, 1863.

⁸⁶ *Richmond Whig*, January 14, 1863.

⁸⁷ *Mobile Register and Advertiser*, June 9, August 14, 1861.

⁸⁸ August 19, 1863. Citizens were especially warned against the croaker. "Let him

Editorial pages presented logical arguments in defense of standard southern ideology concerning secession, state rights, slavery, and the theory of a master race.⁸⁹ Beyond that, most of the papers endeavored to acquaint the southern mind with the necessity of conscription, higher taxes, the twenty-Negro law, home defense, the burning of endangered cotton, the planting of more food crops, and, toward the end of the war, the need for a dictatorship.⁹⁰

Of all the arguments used by southern editors,⁹¹ the most powerful was probably the threat of the consequences of failure. The leaders of the Confederacy would be tried for treason and hanged.⁹² Plantations would be divided into farms of forty acres "for the exclusive benefit of this migratory, fanatical, spirit-rapping, free love, ism-be-crazed population" of the North.⁹³ There would be no trial by jury, no habeas corpus. "If we are conquered, we are outlaws and felons."⁹⁴

button hole you for five minutes and you are lost. You will intone like a rain crow. The blackness of darkness will cover the earth. The sight of Confederate money will give you a pain in the stomach. The price of putty will be appalling. The child of yours who dares to eat more than one thin bacon rind will be regarded by you as a murderer. It will occur to you that interest on Confederate bonds ought to be 8 per cent a day, payable in gold. It will suggest itself to you that the duty of a wife in war times is either to take in washing and support herself, or else to remain in bed and limit herself to one chicken scrap a week. The length of the war and the age of Methuselah will strike you as identically the same. There will be a great many sour grapes this year. You will wish that President Davis and his cabinet were hung with a cow itch vine. The population of the North will be four billion, the population of the South will be about three hundred and eleven, mostly infants at the breast. Every blade of grass will turn into a Yankee, armed with a ten inch columbiad. You will think it high time for Gabriel to blow his horn. Finally you will take to believing telegraphic despatches and to borrowing newspapers. And then you will die." *Richmond Whig*, July 30, 1863.

⁸⁹ Moore, *Conscription and Conflict*, 145.

⁹⁰ *Richmond Examiner*, November 29, 1861, April 15, 1864; *Jackson Daily Mississippian*, June 19, 1862; *Charleston Mercury*, July 30, 1862, March 14, April 14, 1863, March 10, 1864; *Mobile Register and Advertiser*, February 17, March 21, 26, 1863; *Richmond Whig*, May 29, November 13, 1863; *Montgomery Weekly Mail*, August 12, 1863.

⁹¹ The women of the Confederacy were entreated to use their influence for purposes of morale. See *Richmond Examiner*, February 2, 1862; *Charleston Mercury*, July 18, 1863; *Montgomery Weekly Mail*, October 15, 1863; *Richmond Whig*, August 10, 1863. The people were often told that they were enduring privations similar to those of their revolutionary forefathers, and their trials were compared with those of the Prussians after Jena. *Charleston Mercury*, August 26, 1863, April 16, December 23, 1864.

⁹² *Montgomery Weekly Advertiser*, June 12, 1861.

⁹³ *Montgomery Weekly Mail*, August 8, 1862.

⁹⁴ *Richmond Whig*, September 9, 1863.

Southern mothers would be cooking for Yankee mistresses, wives would be washing the dirty linen of Yankee officers, daughters playing chambermaid to Yankee heiresses. Amalgamation would result.⁹⁵ "The white wives, which they have promised to their negro followers, are our sisters and our sweethearts. Think of that, men of the South. Unless you throw these wretches howling back to their haunts of impurity . . . you will be 'of all men most miserable.'" ⁹⁶ Thus the southern editors sought to revive the fast-ebbing spirit of the Confederacy in the closing year of the war.

It may have been, as Governor Vance thought, that "the great *popular heart*" had never been in the war. Certainly, if we may believe the statement of John M. Daniel of the *Richmond Examiner*, that "no powerful nation has ever been . . . subdued that really determined to fight while there was an inch of ground or a solitary soldier left to defend it,"⁹⁷ we must admit that the Confederacy, probably some time after Gettysburg and Vicksburg, lost the will-to-live. The means for an aggressive, well-organized, and sustained attack on popular opinion, seemingly unnecessary in 1861, were not present in the rural, individualistic, almost frontier South.⁹⁸ The chance of reaching the masses through normal associations and contacts was small indeed, and the creation from the ground up of effective propaganda machinery, if considered at all, must have been shunted aside until it was too late. The central and state governments, numerous individuals, the school, the church, and the press, were unable to arouse in the people an irresistible determination to fight an all-out war. Tremendous efforts were made, but they were sporadic, voluntary, unsystematized, and uneven in merit. One of the tragic failures of the Confederacy lay in the unsolved problem of civilian morale.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, July 17, 1863.

⁹⁶ *Richmond Examiner*, April 18, 1864. This paper, on February 19, 1864, summed up the consequences: "confiscation, brutality, military domination, insult, universal poverty, the beggary of millions, the triumph of the vilest individuals in these communities, the abasement of the honest and industrious, the outlawry of slaves, the destruction of agriculture and commerce, the emigration of all thriving citizens, the scorn of the world, the sullen sense of wrong and infamy."

⁹⁷ *Richmond Examiner*, February 19, 1862.

⁹⁸ Ramsdell, "The Problem of Public Morale in the Southern Confederacy," 2-3.

The Teaching Techniques of the Farmers' Alliance: An Experiment in Adult Education

BY HOMER CLEVINGER

The leaders who developed within the Farmers' Alliance in the 1880's were the vanguard of the Progressive movement which, in the twentieth century, probably brought to our statute books far more radical laws than the Alliance would have sanctioned. Theodore Roosevelt's Square Deal and Woodrow Wilson's New Freedom were resulting skirmishes. The New Deal became a pitched battle, and in many respects the Republican platform of 1944 could be said to represent unconditional surrender.

"Agitation, education, organization" was the announced campaign strategy of Alliance leaders. Revolution in government policies was their objective. They wanted to modify *laissez faire* by a program of government control. They expected to accomplish their purpose by wielding the political influence of a united farm front.

The leaders of the Farmers' Alliance deserve better than history has thus far given them. If nothing more, they should be credited as able leaders in a cause which was unpopular with the conservatives of their day.¹ Their political enemies christened some of them with nicknames which are testimony of the disdain, perhaps the fear, in which the farmers were held. There were "Pitchfork Ben" Tillman of South Carolina, "Sockless Jerry" Simpson and "Yellin' Mary" Lease of Kansas, "Stump"

¹John D. Hicks, *The Populist Revolt* (Minneapolis, 1931), is a sympathetic history of the farmers' movement. Hicks says (p. 126): "The national officers were given power, were well paid, and were expected to accomplish something."

Ashby of Texas, and Tom Watson of Georgia whom Speaker Thomas B. Reed compared with the son of a wild jackass. James B. Weaver of Iowa, twice candidate for President of the United States, William A. Pepper, once United States senator from Kansas, and Ignatius Donnelly of Minnesota were among the other better known leaders.

A friendly contemporary was near the truth when he described the Alliance as a national university which employed "hundreds of college educated as well as self-taught teachers, who [were able to] stimulate thought and lend inspiration to their fellows."² Certainly this might have been said of Uriel S. Hall, who directed the educational program in Missouri, 1889-1890, and served as president of the Missouri Alliance, 1890-1891. Hall was trained in law, was an able speaker, and was somewhat more conservative than other leaders. During his life, he served four years in Congress, was president of a small Missouri college, and spent his declining years as the operator of a private school in Columbia, Missouri. His speeches were not the wild harangues of an agitator but closely developed arguments full of allusions to John Stuart Mill and other economists. In the middle 1890's he was opposed to the free coinage of silver at sixteen to one. In his arguments to carry his followers with him, he expounded the economic law, "A bad money will drive good money out of circulation." His erudition was manifested when he told one audience that Nicolo Oresme had stated the theory in 1366 and that Copernicus had written about the principle long before Sir Thomas Gresham, whose name the law bears.³

Like good educators, the Alliance teachers formulated objectives for their educational program. They understood that government intervention in behalf of agricultural interests would not solve all the problems. They hoped to improve social life among the farmers and to make them better business managers. Their aims, in the words of the official historian of the Southern Alliance, were:

² Charles S. Walker, "The Farmers' Movement," in *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (Philadelphia, 1890-), IV (1894), 793-94.

³ Homer Clevenger, *Agrarian Politics in Missouri, 1880-1896* (Publication No. 222, University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, 1940), 103.

By our frequent meetings we confidently believe that we shall be able to break up the isolated habits of farmers, improve their social conditions, increase their social pleasures, and strengthen their confidence and friendship for each other.

Through our organization we shall endeavor to furnish facilities for and shall encourage the study of the laws of business and trade, the best methods of buying and selling, and the transaction of all business it may be desirable for farmers and laborers to engage in.

Without disturbing party lines or affiliations or provoking feelings of party strife, . . . we shall discuss and investigate laws, public measures, and government policies that affect the producing masses. We shall approve the good and condemn the bad through the ballot. Our program shall be unfaltering hostility to all class legislation, tyranny and monopoly, excessive taxation, lavish expenditure, and all the wrongs and abuses by government. We shall try to understand the organization, powers, and purposes of government and qualify ourselves to judge correctly the merits of candidates for office.⁴

For syllabi the leaders in the educational program used the platforms of demands adopted at the numerous state, regional, and national conventions.⁵ Their aim was to secure the farmers' support for the items in the platforms.⁶

Even today it would seem improbable that a national political force could be built on a community of agreement among farmers. In the 1880's uniting the farmers on a platform of new economic and political theories must have seemed impossible. Then, even more than now, the nature of the farming enterprise made farmers individualists and conservatives. Farmers, especially those of the South, had been the staunchest supporters of Thomas Jefferson's doctrine of state rights and his maxim, "The least government is the best government." Lack of information narrowed the farmers' views and made them provincial.

⁴ W. Scott Morgan, *History of the Wheel and Alliance and the Impending Revolution* (Fort Scott, Kansas, 1891), 135-44.

⁵ Hicks, *The Populist Revolt*, 427-44, reprints several of these platforms.

⁶ For some contemporary views of the farmers' movement, see Frank M. Drew, "The Present Farmers' Movement," in *Political Science Quarterly* (New York, 1886-), VI (1891), 282-310, and Washington Gladden, "The Embattled Farmers," in *Forum* (New York, 1886-1930), X (1890), 315-22.

Their ability to think in the abstractions of political science was hindered by lack of education.

Each section was suspicious of the other. The hatreds engendered by the Civil War were still alive. Partisan prejudices in the North had been nourished by a series of "bloody shirt" campaigns and in the South by fresh memories of the Reconstruction period. "Democrats consider it a sin to vote the Republican ticket," wrote John B. Henderson of St. Louis to his friend, James S. Rollins of Columbia, Missouri.⁷ A Tennessee editor told his readers, ". . . the meanest Democrat is an angel compared to the best Republican God ever made."⁸

The success of the Alliance leaders would have been impossible if the 1880's had been ordinary times. But they were not. By that time the industrial revolution had passed through the early stages and the process of merging small businesses into larger ones was well on the way. No long period of experience had developed a code of business ethics. Legislation lagged behind economic developments. Competition proceeded under the law of the tooth and the fang. Railroads charged all the traffic would bear. Monopolists set their prices by the law of diminishing returns.

Farmers, as little business men, were at the mercy of the unethical. Prices for their products steadily declined at the very time when they needed to spend more. Their businesses were in a state of transition from a way of life to a commercial enterprise. They needed more capital outlay for the new machinery then coming into use. Their cost of living, in terms of cash, went up as the new processes in manufacturing and facilities in transportation tempted their wives to forsake the home industries of spinning, weaving, tailoring, soap making, canning, and preserving. Farmers were also yearning for the many things

⁷ John B. Henderson to James S. Rollins, August 14, 1878, in James S. Rollins Papers (State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia). Henderson was a Republican with liberal views. As senator from Missouri he voted against the impeachment of Andrew Johnson, and as a result lost much of his Missouri following. Rollins had been a Whig before the Civil War, and served in the Union army during the war, but became a Democrat after 1865. His political philosophy was much like that of Henderson.

⁸ Daniel M. Robison, *Bob Taylor and the Agrarian Revolt in Tennessee* (Chapel Hill, 1935), 146.

needed to make farm life more enjoyable. Buggies and carriages, pianos and organs, carpets and curtains, kerosene lamps, cookstoves, and steam washers made calls on their bank accounts.⁹ Many of the over-optimistic mortgaged their farms to buy what they wanted. When conditions failed to get better, thousands of these lost their homes. Others must have suffered in fear that a drought or a hailstorm would bring the sheriff to their doors.¹⁰

All farmers felt that they had a grievance. They might admit that some of the fault was theirs, but they were certain that part of the blame lay elsewhere. Their restlessness and discontent increased as the nineteenth century drew nearer to a close. They were eager to listen to anyone who would diagnose their troubles. In the language of the professor of education, the psychological set and learning readiness were present when the agitators, educators, and organizers began to appear on the scene.

The educational program of the Alliance did not begin with the rise of the movement in the early 1880's. Except for the Northern Alliance, the movement had a grass-roots beginning. In nearly every state of the South and in a few of the North, a local farm club was expanded into a state organization.¹¹ By the middle 1880's several state organizations had been perfected. Then came the urge to nationalize the movement.

The Northern Alliance had begun as a regional organization and a few of the southwestern states had merged by December, 1889. At that time joint and concurrent conventions were called to meet in St. Louis for the purpose of making the movement national in scope. Negotia-

⁹ Charles F. Emerick, "An Analysis of Agrarian Discontent in the United States," in *Political Science Quarterly*, XI (1896), 622-23; Alfred H. Peters, "The Depreciation of Farm Lands," in *Quarterly Journal of Economics* (Boston, 1886-), IV (1889), 27; S. K. Fowler, "The American Farmer," an address before a Farmers' Institute at Edina, Missouri, in *Twenty-first Annual Report of the State Board of Agriculture of the State of Missouri, 1888-1889* (Jefferson City, 1889), 35-46; D. R. McAnally, "The Book and the Plow," in *Seventeenth Annual Report of the Missouri State Board of Agriculture for 1883* (Jefferson City, 1884), 141-49.

¹⁰ John D. Barnhart, "Rainfall and the Populist Party in Nebraska," in *American Political Science Review* (Baltimore, 1906-), XIX (1925), 527-40.

¹¹ See Hicks, *The Populist Revolt*, 96-127, for a full treatment of this development.

tions, however, failed to produce a national organization. The northern and southern groups could not agree on some practices and purposes.¹² Two organizations were the result. The southern group, which was the larger, was extended to include Kansas, the Dakotas, and a few other northern states. The educational programs, which were intensified after the attempt to effect a national merger, were so much alike that no distinction need be made in discussing them.

The Alliance school did not lack enrollment. By August, 1890, it was estimated that 3,000,000 farmers had joined the Alliance. These were divided among the several states, with Missouri and Texas leading.¹³ Full growth had not been reached by 1890, for at that time the membership in Missouri totaled only 200,000. Early in 1891 it had grown to 240,000.¹⁴

The members in each community belonged to local lodges, of which there were about 4,000 in Missouri alone. Moniteau County had 41 and Boone County, 42.¹⁵ On the average, there was about one for every township. At the local lodges all over the country the members assembled in bi-weekly or monthly sessions. Attendance was required, and these became the basic agency through which the Alliance leaders taught their lessons.

To supplement the local meetings, speakers were sent to talk to farmers gathered at picnics and barbecues.¹⁶ Whenever a good speech had been made, it was printed and mailed to the locals.¹⁷ Both state and regional organizations adopted some newspaper or magazine for an

¹² Herman C. Nixon, "The Cleavage within the Farmers' Alliance Movement," in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1914-), XV (1928), 22-33.

¹³ Fred E. Haynes, *Third Party Movements since the Civil War, with Special Reference to Iowa* (Iowa City, 1916), 234-35; *Appleton's Annual Cyclopaedia*, 42 vols. (New York, 1862-1903), New Ser., Vol. XV (1890), p. 301.

¹⁴ Clevenger, *Agrarian Politics in Missouri*, 96-97.

¹⁵ *Columbia Missouri Statesman*, March 26, 1890; *California (Mo.) The Newspaper*, June 6, 1889.

¹⁶ Alex M. Arnett, *The Populist Movement in Georgia* (New York, 1922), 100; *St. Louis Republic*, July 28, 1888; August 22, 1890.

¹⁷ *History of the Alliance, the Agricultural Wheel, the Farmers' and Laborers' Union, the Farmers' Mutual Benefit Association, and Other Farm Organizations*, edited and compiled by the *St. Louis Journal of Agriculture*, official organ of the Farmers' and Laborers' Union of Missouri (St. Louis, 1890), 147.

official organ. Members were strongly urged to become subscribers. A National Reform Press Association, composed of fifteen hundred editors, was organized at a national convention at Ocala, Florida, in 1890. These newspapers, largely rural weeklies, reached a large proportion of the farmers.¹⁸ A system of exchanges enabled the editors to keep their readers abreast of the developments all over the country. Through them the Alliance teachers could easily reach their students.

Circulars, pamphlets, and books were printed, some by the million.¹⁹ The farmers were urged to read such books as Bellamy's *Looking Backward*, Donnelly's *Caesar's Column*, Powderly's *Thirty Years of Labor*, Peffer's *The Farmer's Side*, and Weaver's *A Call to Action*.²⁰ To arouse the farmers' interest, the Reform Press printed questions and answers on these books and often sold them with their subscriptions. With all these educational agencies at hand, their aims and objects in view, their syllabi prepared, and their students enrolled, the teachers could begin to present their course.

Attaining the first two aims, the improvement of social life and business management, was not difficult. The periodic meetings in the locals, social affairs promoted by the clubs, and frequent picnics and barbecues cultivated the farmers' inclination to enjoy association with their neighbors. There was an immediate financial motive for the farmers to study new and improved methods of cultivation and stock raising. If better business management would increase their profits, they wanted to know it. Their eagerness to have this kind of information was indicated by a growing demand for farm magazines. One editor, years afterward, reported the 1880's a prosperous period for farm periodicals.²¹ Publishers rushed to supply the market. Over one hundred new

¹⁸ On circulation of the newspapers, see Hicks, *The Populist Revolt*, 131, and Walker, "The Farmers' Movement," *loc. cit.*, 794.

¹⁹ St. Louis *Republic*, September 15, 1891; Harry Barnard, "Eagle Forgotten," *The Life of John Peter Altgeld* (New York, 1938), 346.

²⁰ Hicks, *The Populist Revolt*, 129-31; Arnett, *Populist Movement in Georgia*, 100; Robert L. Hunt, *History of the Farmers' Movement in the Southwest, 1873-1925* (College Station, Texas, 1935), 11.

²¹ John M. Stahl, *Growing with the West* (New York, 1930), 88.

ones were brought out between 1880 and 1885.²² Nearly all newspaper editors regularly gave space to articles on farm management.

Attainment of the third aim, changing the farmers' political thinking and rousing them to action, was a different problem. The leaders challenged the farmers to learn in words the farmers could understand and with remarks designed to stir their emotions. One shouted at an audience: "If we want something we must act intelligently and elect those who will do what we want. . . . It is the boast of sharpers and tricksters that we do not have intelligence enough to recognize and defend our own interests. . . . Monopolies and corporations hire the very best skill to secure their ends in legislation."²³ An editor, in a little less elegant style, wrote: "Why make a jackass out of yourself when a little horse sense would save you from becoming a beast of burden?"²⁴

In like vein the leaders strove to develop a spirit of group consciousness. The farmers were told that manufacturers and lenders thought farmers existed only to make others rich and that farmers were "like unarmed men among desperadoes."²⁵ They were told that lawyers filled most of the offices of government and dismissed a farmer who presented a plea with a shrug and the remark, "He is nothing but a farmer."²⁶ A country versus city psychosis was cultivated. Farmers were informed that their "city friends" looked "down on them as one-gallused country Jakes."²⁷ In retaliation the Reform Press, through its exchange, circulated the definition of a "city dude": "A dood iz a

²² Frank L. Mott, *A History of American Magazines, 1741-1885*, 3 vols. (New York-Cambridge, 1930-1938), III, 151.

²³ J. A. Fulbright (member of the Missouri State Board of Agriculture), "Organization, Education, Co-operation of the Farmers," a speech before a meeting at Rolla, Missouri, in *Nineteenth Annual Report of the Missouri State Board of Agriculture for 1886-1887* (Jefferson City, 1887), 343.

²⁴ California (Mo.) *The Newspaper*, January 31, 1889.

²⁵ St. Louis *Republic*, March 29, 1888.

²⁶ California (Mo.) *The Newspaper*, April 10, 1890; August 30, 1894; *History of the Alliance, the Agricultural Wheel*, 210.

²⁷ Abiel Leonard (member of the Missouri State Board of Agriculture), in a speech on "General Agriculture," delivered at Jefferson City, in *Nineteenth Annual Report of the Missouri State Board of Agriculture*, 430-31.

2 legged animal with a hat on 1 end and shuz on the uther, and a hole in his hed where uther people has branes."²⁸

Convincing the farmers that they should improve their minds and that they were a downtrodden class was easy compared with eliminating sectionalism. Banishing sectional hatreds had been the hope of the left-wing farm parties since 1880.²⁹ The Alliance leaders planned to do something about it. Leonidas L. Polk of North Carolina, who was elected president of the Southern Alliance at St. Louis in 1889, said: "We propose to wipe the Mason-Dixon line out of our geography."³⁰ After the St. Louis meeting, *The National Alliance*, published in Houston, Texas, reported that the "bloody chasm" had been "bridged."³¹ The Virginia State Alliance announced, "We intend to grasp and tighten the Alliance grip on the hands of our Alliance brethren of the North."³²

In February, 1892, a pageant was presented before a national convention of farmers in St. Louis. Former Union soldiers, in uniform, advanced to the center of the stage from one wing and former Confederates from the other. They clasped hands as the flag waved and the crowd cheered. Then came prayer, bolstered with "Amens," and followed by a resolution that it was "time to bury in one tomb the disunion, malice and hate resulting from the war."³³

Any indication of success in the efforts to overcome sectional or political prejudice was news. A Blue and Gray meeting in Knoxville, Tennessee, was considered worthy of a souvenir edition by a local paper.³⁴ The St. Louis *Republic* told of a Macon, Missouri, local which had elected a Democrat for president and Republicans for secretary and lecturer.³⁵ The Memphis (Missouri) *Farmers' Union* proclaimed the educational program a success. In a Kansas convention "an ex-

²⁸ California (Mo.) *The Newspaper*, May 2, 1895.

²⁹ Fred E. Haynes, *James B. Weaver* (Iowa City, 1919), 165.

³⁰ Arnett, *Populist Movement in Georgia*, 133.

³¹ California (Mo.) *The Newspaper*, January 2, 1890.

³² St. Louis (semi-weekly) *Republic*, August 23, 1890.

³³ *Ibid.*, February 26, 1892.

³⁴ Memphis (Tenn.) *Daily Commercial*, October 10, 1891.

³⁵ St. Louis *Republic*, July 2, 1890.

Union soldier, with one arm," had "nominated an ex-Confederate and his name" had been "placed on the ticket with a whoop!"³⁶ The St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* was pleased when "mossback Democrats and ultra Republicans sat side by side" in a convention in a strong Democratic country in southern Missouri, but glumly challenged South Carolina or Mississippi to elect a Republican when it reported the election of a former Confederate as congressman-at-large from Kansas.³⁷ All this free publicity helped the teachers in their work.

To eradicate sectional prejudices and build up a class consciousness, the Alliance teachers appealed through the emotions. But, to impart their theories of political economy, they were compelled to use the intellectual approach. The outline of their presentation first called for an analysis of the farmers' condition, then for determining the cause, and finally the proposal of remedies.³⁸

The subjects to be discussed in the bi-weekly or monthly meetings of the local lodges were suggested by state and national officers. Constant urging through the official organs kept the local officers on the alert.³⁹ Through the Reform Press the national president in 1891 proposed these questions as the basis for an evening's program: "What is money? What are the uses of money? Is money a commodity? Who furnishes the money for the country? Who ought to furnish it? How should money be furnished to the people?"⁴⁰ National bankers were probably abused when these questions were answered by farmers in open forum.

Sometimes the local Reform editor would print an article on the topic of the hour and would then pose questions designed to promote an exchange of views on meeting nights. At other times a speech by some outsider or a debate would open the discussion period.

Following is a program advertised for an evening session at a local lodge in Moniteau County, Missouri:

³⁶ Memphis (Mo.) *Farmers' Union*, June 23, 1892.

³⁷ St. Louis *Globe-Democrat*, August 23, 1888, and November 11, 1892.

³⁸ Morgan, *History of the Wheel and Alliance*, 265.

³⁹ California (Mo.) *The Newspaper*, November 7, 1889; March 19, 1891; Memphis (Mo.) *Farmers' Union*, February 18, 1892.

⁴⁰ California (Mo.) *The Newspaper*, July 9, 1891.

1. Song—"Poor Kansas Fools."
2. History of the Order.
3. Aims and Purposes of the Organization.
4. Paper and Discussion of the Same.
5. Speech—"Are We a Free People?"
6. Song—"Almost Persuaded" [A parody, which might have had the more definite title "Almost Persuaded to Bolt My Old Party"].
7. What the Order Has Accomplished.
8. What is Money?
9. Song—"Good-bye My Party, Good-bye."⁴¹

The Alliance teachers correlated the work of all the other agencies with that done in the local meetings. They seemed to understand the achievement level of their pupils. Most farmers had not advanced far beyond the three R's in formal education, and had read but little afterward. The average farmer had probably never seriously considered national economic problems except during political campaigns. Then his mind had been closed to one side of the question. The techniques used indicate that the teachers tailored the logic to fit the pupils.

After reminding the farmers that their net return was the market price less freight charges, a convincing argument like this was presented: It costs \$96 to ship a car of wheat from Jasper County to St. Louis but only \$46 to ship a car of ore. The railroad has two prices for shipping the same weight in the same kind of car going the same distance. The railroad makes \$75 profit on the wheat and \$25 on the ore. If the mine owner were forced to pay as much as the farmer, he would have to close his mine. Here is proof that the railroad is charging all the traffic will bear. "If a man boards a train and holds up the people for all there is in their pockets, it is robbery: when Jay Gould takes all the traffic will bear, that is business."⁴² It was also charged that every time the farmers tried to secure legislation to stop such practices, the railroad lobby defeated their purpose. If railroads could not be regulated by law, they argued, the government should secure ownership and, like England and Prussia, operate them for the benefit of the

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, October 2, 1890.

⁴² *History of the Alliance, the Agricultural Wheel*, 15-31. The quotation is from California (Mo.) *The Newspaper*, April 28, 1892.

people. To them there was as much reason for the government to haul food as to haul mail.⁴³

The Alliance teachers resorted to the historical approach in teaching the quantitative theory of money. They reminded the farmers that hogs sold for nine and ten cents a pound and wheat for \$2.50 per bushel in the period from 1866 to 1868. There were no tramps, no mortgages, and farmers were lenders instead of borrowers. Then, the circulating medium was fifty dollars per capita. Now (1889), with only six dollars per capita, hogs were selling at three and one half cents and wheat at sixty cents. Farms were mortgaged and farmers received hardly enough to pay interest and taxes. It was also contended that from 1878 to 1882 there was an honest inflation of probably forty per cent, and that failures were few and "business men could approach the ideal of doing business on a cash basis." When the inflation was stopped in 1882, prices began to go down and failures to increase. If there was more money in circulation the farmers would have better prices, better homes, and could pay off their mortgages. There would be fewer trusts and the people would be lifted nearer to the level of capitalists.⁴⁴ With national banks in charge of circulation, exclaimed one editor, it was no wonder that farmers were on a credit system!⁴⁵

To the farmers who knew that debts were burdensome, keeping the national bank system could be made to look like foolish government policy. By pointing out that the system was based on an interest-bearing bonded indebtedness, and that the government had a surplus in the treasury, it was easy to proceed to the question: Why not pay off these bonds, stop the interest, and get rid of the national banks? Attention was called to the fact that under the national bank system, the taxpayers paid three per cent interest on the bonds and eight per cent on the money they borrowed from the banks, while the bank paid the treasury one per cent for issuing the currency. As a result, it was said,

⁴³ The freight and postal system analogy was used in demands formulated at St. Louis both in 1889 and 1892.

⁴⁴ These arguments were advanced in California (Mo.) *The Newspaper*, January 31, February 7, and October 17, 1889.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, October 10, 1889, quoting the Lincoln (Neb.) *Alliance*.

the borrowers of the country paid ten per cent on the money they borrowed; and the question was raised as to why it would not be just as logical for the government to lend money to the farmers on non-perishable products as to lend money to the banks on bonds. Under such a plan the farmers could pay two per cent on the money and thus save eight per cent.⁴⁶

By use of the same techniques and all the agencies for education, the Alliance teachers sought to inform the farmers about the other Alliance demands. Among these were tariff revision, income tax, anti-monopoly laws, and restrictions on option-dealing in farm products. The information presented may often have been false; the causes for pictured conditions may have been irrelevant; and some of the remedies advocated may have been violations of all the laws of finance and economics; but the farmers were convinced of their validity and agreed that government intervention was necessary to secure economic equality.

Efforts to obtain remedial legislation produced the motive for studying political science. Alliance leaders, especially those of the South, advocated the seizure of existing party machinery as a means of achieving their purpose. Both Democrats and Republicans were urged to attend township conventions of their own parties. They were instructed to elect party officers and delegates who were favorable to farmers' demands. In these party conventions the teachers had an excellent laboratory for demonstrating the arts, wiles, and stratagems of practical politics.

In trying to put through legislation with their own lobbies, the farmers learned how pressure politics influence government from the county upward. The obstacles which they met in the course of those efforts served the Alliance teachers as object lessons to prove the need for reforms. When employers in the cities were accused of telling laborers how to vote, a secret ballot and a corrupt practices act were demanded. When farmers learned how "wire pullers" could control a convention,

⁴⁶ The Southern Alliance, at St. Louis in 1889, proposed a sub-treasury system through which farmers could borrow money at two per cent. The money was supposed to be a paper currency secured by warehouse receipts for non-perishable farm products. When the loan was repaid the currency was to be withdrawn from circulation.

they proposed primary elections. When the President and Senate proved to be stumbling blocks for farm bills, the direct election of these officers was advocated. When state executives and legislators failed to keep campaign promises, the virtues of the recall, initiative, and referendum were expounded.

The Alliance teachers can be commended for their teaching techniques. The success of an educational program, however, must be measured by its effect on the thinking and acting of the pupils. In the judgment of many contemporaries their influence was remarkable. In 1890, for example, Governor David R. Francis of Missouri, in his annual message to the General Assembly, said: "The . . . farmers . . . seem to have become thoroughly aroused to the realization of their burthens and are making concerted and intelligent effort to correct the evils from which they suffer."⁴⁷ Two years earlier, the St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* had reported that farmers were a reading and thinking people.⁴⁸ Writing several years afterward, one contemporary said: "Despite the poverty of the country, the books of Henry George, Bellamy, and other economic writers were bought as fast as dealers could supply them. They were bought to be read greedily; and nourished by the fascination of novelty and the zeal of enthusiasm, thoughts and theories sprouted like weeds after a May shower."⁴⁹ Another observer reported that the whole country was "filled with a spirit of investigation" and that "questions respecting finance and government functions" were studied "as no where else in the world. . . . It is marvelous how these men will furnish readily and confidently solutions for all problems of finance—the most delicate and least understood of all government concerns."⁵⁰

How well the Alliance leaders succeeded in changing government policy can be learned by referring to the statute books. To give the

⁴⁷ Floyd C. Shoemaker and others (eds.), *Messages and Proclamations of the Governors of the State of Missouri, 1820-1909*, 9 vols. (Columbia, 1922), VII, 224.

⁴⁸ St. Louis *Globe-Democrat*, September 21, 1888.

⁴⁹ Hicks, *The Populist Revolt*, 132, quoting Elizabeth Higgins, *Out of the West* (New York, 1902), 133, 136.

⁵⁰ Frank B. Tracy, "Rise and Doom of the Populist Movement," in *Forum*, XVI (1893), 244-48.

farm movement entire credit for the passage of any specific law is perhaps questionable, but several which met the farmers' demands can be cited. The Interstate Commerce Act, the Sherman Anti-trust Act, the Sherman Silver Purchase Act, and the tariff and income tax acts of 1893 can be put in the list. Besides these laws passed by Congress, others were enacted by state legislatures. Between 1887 and 1893, the Missouri legislature passed acts to regulate railroads, outlaw monopolies, forbid option-dealing in farm products, and reduce the legal rate of interest from ten to eight per cent. The Australian ballot, state controlled primaries, and a corrupt practices act became law during the same years. In the early 1900's the initiative and referendum were added to Missouri's constitution.

If government policies and legislation reflect changes in the political thinking of the people, the influence of the Alliance teachers did not end with the passing of their organization in the early 1890's. Many of the reforms which they demanded became law after 1900.⁵¹ The list is much too long to include in an appraisal of the teaching techniques used in the Alliance school, but its length is in itself an additional bit of testimony on the effectiveness of the teaching.

⁵¹ Clarence Roberts, "Congressional History of the Populists" (M. A. thesis, University of Missouri, 1936).

The Bourbon Period in Mississippi Politics, 1875-1890

BY (MISS) WILLIE D. HALSELL

"We do not know what a Bourbon Democrat means," declared the editor of the *Memphis Appeal* in 1875, "unless it implies that there is a class of old politicians, who, . . . forgetting nothing and learning nothing, do not recognize any issue as settled by the war and are ready to inaugurate another rebellion. We know of no such Democrats."¹ To this description other contemporaries added the statements that the Bourbons "were not content to accept the war amendments" to the Constitution² and that they were the "irreconcilables."³ In accordance with its historical origin the name suggests a ruling group, once dethroned but now returned to power, who stubbornly hold to the past and refuse to adapt themselves to a changing world about them.⁴

Upon application of the above descriptions it will appear that very few leaders in Mississippi during the period of so-called Bourbon ascendancy were eligible for the name of Bourbon. When the Mississippi Democrats regained power in 1875, the last two ante-bellum senators were inactive: Jefferson Davis was disfranchised; Albert G. Brown was living in political retirement. Of the five men who represented the

¹ *Memphis Appeal*, April 16, 1875.

² Edward Mayes, *Lucius Q. C. Lamar: His Life, Times, and Speeches, 1825-1893* (Nashville, 1896), 394-95.

³ Raymond (Miss.) *Hinds County Gazette*, January 7, 1880; *Memphis Appeal*, April 16, 1875.

⁴ See Alex M. Arnett, *The Populist Movement in Georgia* (New York, 1922), 22 and footnote; C. Vann Woodward, "Bourbonism in Georgia," in *North Carolina Historical Review* (Raleigh, 1924-), XVI (1939), 23-24; C. Vann Woodward, *Tom Watson, Agrarian Rebel* (New York, 1938), 56.

state in Congress at the beginning of the war, one had been killed at Gettysburg, another died early in Reconstruction, and a third, Reuben Davis, was engaging in a successful law practice that won for him the reputation of one of the foremost criminal lawyers of the state; and when he briefly re-entered politics later, it was as a Greenbacker. The other two, Lucius Q. C. Lamar and Otho R. Singleton, regained their positions during Reconstruction. Jacob Thompson, who had been a member of President James Buchanan's cabinet, took no part in post-Civil War politics. Of the immediate pre-war governors, none again held that office or influenced politics to any appreciable extent after 1875.

Not one of the Mississippi Democratic leaders, including the two former Congressmen, could be described as unreconciled to Reconstruction. They conceded that the war had ended secession; they accepted the amendments; and they determined to make the best of the situation. True, they were the ruling class and they entrenched themselves securely in political power, but they were not the ultra-conservatives of the party. In 1875, therefore, the term Bourbon could apply to Mississippi Democratic leaders in only a limited sense.

There were Mississippi Democrats, however, to whom the term did apply; for these men refused to accept defeat and Reconstruction. Though Mississippi had no such outstanding irreconcilable as Georgia had in Robert Toombs (because of his peculiar status Jefferson Davis could hardly be included here), Mississippi had "die hards" whose heads were bloody and unbowed. They did not hold high offices and they were greatly outnumbered, but because several of them were influential and capable editors, their voices were heard occasionally in newspaper columns and briefly on the floors of party assemblies.

These unreconstructed rebels received their death blow at the Democratic state convention in August, 1875. This, the first Democratic party convention held in Mississippi since before the war, was well attended; for it was expected that a fierce battle would be fought for control of the party. The "die hards," called Bourbons by more than one editor, were led by William H. McCardle, a former Whig and the

editor of the Vicksburg *Commercial*, and A. J. Frantz, editor of the Brandon *Republican*. They hoped to force the adoption of a color-line plank in the platform, but the Democrats who determined the convention's policies considered such a plank suicidal for the party and its prospects.⁵ Among the leaders against the color line were men such as Albert G. Brown, Ethelbert Barksdale, and John W. C. Watson, who in the early days of Reconstruction had urged acceptance of federal acts.⁶ The keynote speaker and dominant personality of the assembly, L. Q. C. Lamar, had made a timely plea for sectional reconciliation in his eulogy on Charles Sumner on the floor of Congress only the previous year.

The battle within the party came into the open when the preamble and platform were placed before the convention for adoption. The color-line question was pushed out of sight and the "die hards" took issue with the name adopted for the reorganized Democracy—the Democrat Conservatives. By use of this label the Democrats hoped that they would win over dissatisfied Republicans, Whigs, and all others opposed to Radical Republicans in Mississippi, and also impress the Liberal Republicans in the North. But hardly had the last word of the platform been read when McCardle promptly rose and by the "flash of his eye and excited manner" showed that he planned to fight. He ridiculed the word "Conservative" as part of the party name. Declaring himself an old line Whig now turned Democrat, he scorned the suggestion that possibly 10,000 votes would be won by that label. Furthermore, he said, his county stood "uncompromisingly" on the color line which he had been instructed to support. An anticipatory tremor ran over the convention, but Wiley P. Harris and others answered him at

⁵ Jackson (Miss.) *Pilot*, May 22, 1875; Memphis *Appeal*, July 31, 1877. Reuben Davis, a delegate, also favored a color line, but his county platform disapproved. Testimony of Reuben Davis, in *Senate Reports*, 44 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 527, Vol. II, p. 1062.

⁶ Testimony of H. T. Fisher, editor of Jackson *Pilot* and Jackson *Times*, in *Senate Reports*, 44 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 527, Vol. I, p. 534; Albert G. Brown to Zachariah Chandler, January 4, 1868, in Zachariah Chandler Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress); James B. Ranck, *Albert Gallatin Brown, Radical Southern Nationalist* (New York, 1937), 252-74.

length, after which the platform was adopted "almost unanimously." The irreconcilables were decisively defeated at this time.⁷

The anti-color-line leaders, who considered themselves "liberals," now nominated congressional candidates from four districts. Another "liberal," James Z. George, was elected chairman of the Democratic executive committee for the autumn campaign, and Lamar, the foremost "liberal," made an address before the convention in which he recommended a policy of conciliation in state and nation.⁸

Lamar's utterances, declared a northern newspaper, were similar to those of "Toombs, Wigfall & Co.," for "his Bourbonism is unquestioned."⁹ To the minds of many in the North, political leaders who allied themselves with or worked for the interests of the Democratic party in the South were *ipso facto* Bourbons, irrespective of ante-bellum background or Reconstruction attitude. Gradually within the South the political opponents of the Democratic leaders in power began calling them Bourbons, possibly because that name came to have a stigma attached to it. When many of these Democrats in high offices turned to serving the railroads, manufacturing enterprises, and other business interests while turning deaf ears to the farmers, "Bourbonism" acquired additional economic and class connotations. Though these men after whom is named the later period of Reconstruction were the "liberals" in the convention of 1875, they became the conservatives of the party before the end of the fifteen years of their supremacy.

The period of Bourbon ascendancy in Mississippi may be considered to have begun in 1875 with the defeat of the reactionaries in the Democratic party. The decade following 1890 may be considered as marking the decline and disappearance of Bourbon power in Mississippi, since by that time the prestige of the old leaders was waning, some of them had retired from politics, several had died, and, most significantly, new

⁷ Jackson *Times*, August 4, 1875; Jackson *Clarion*, August 4, 1875. Other parliamentary action which took place need not be given here.

⁸ Jackson *Times*, August 4, 1875; Jackson *Pilot*, August 7, 1875. The "liberals" were also called "conservatives," the term being more or less dependent upon the user's political affiliations.

⁹ New York *Commercial Advertiser*, quoted in Washington (D. C.) *National Republican*, August 14, 1875.

elements and younger leaders were beginning to direct state affairs. Sometimes co-operation with the more sympathetic of the older leaders was agreeable to the new generation of 1890, as was shown in the state constitutional convention of that year. Hastening the decline of Bourbonism were the Farmers' Alliance and the Populist party organization.¹⁰

Not all Mississippi Bourbons stood for the same things. On a few major points most of them agreed. Some wanted to develop industries in Mississippi, and that required the help of outside capital. Since the East was the capitalist section, this meant a rapprochement between East and South. Most of the Bourbons were friendly to the railroads, several of them earning their living at some time as railroad lawyers. Few were bitter against the railroads and corporations. Few were involved in manufacturing enterprises and not one was the head of a large corporation or industry. All thought they were working wisely for the economic improvement of the state. All approved of reconciliation between the sections of the nation. On one outstanding issue in particular the Bourbons, whether for or against the farmers, were agreed, and that was the control of the Negro vote to insure the continuation of white supremacy. Within these general limits there were all kinds of degrees and variations.

The three men most influential in Mississippi politics during the Bourbon period, and therefore the leaders to whom the term "Bourbon" was frequently applied, were Lucius Q. C. Lamar, Edward C. Walthall, and James Z. George. All were United States senators, Walthall succeeding to Lamar's seat when Lamar entered President Grover Cleveland's cabinet in 1885. George was elected in 1880 and held office until his death in 1897. All were lawyers, George probably being the most able of them, though Lamar attained the position of Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court. Both George and Lamar held other public offices; Walthall none of importance until he was appointed senator. Lamar and Walthall were close friends, both born

¹⁰ On Populism in Mississippi, see William D. McCain, "The Populist Party in Mississippi" (M. A. thesis, University of Mississippi, 1931), copy in Mississippi Department of Archives and History.

to the purple. George was never intimate with them, and prided himself on his title of "The Commoner."

In other ways George was unlike his colleagues. Born poor, he plowed in the fields; grown into manhood, he was self-made and proud of it. Though eventually he became wealthy and owned large plantations, he remained at heart the poor man's friend. A blunt and tactless man, he did not possess the charm and courtliness of the other two senators. He was the friend and champion of the farmers. He worked for the establishment of a state agricultural college, and was appointed a trustee of the one which was established. He also approved of experiment stations at agricultural colleges, and advocated farms at those colleges for the purpose, among others, of helping poor boys pay their expenses.¹¹ Mississippi farmers considered him the father of the United States Department of Agriculture.¹² In defense of the farmer, his income, and the effects of monetary policies on him, George's voice was raised on numerous occasions in the Senate.¹³

While he realized the necessity and benefits of corporations, he was convinced that they should be firmly controlled. He was one of the five senators who shaped the Sherman Anti-trust Law into its final form.¹⁴ He supported the Interstate Commerce Act, though he expected the railroads to try to evade it, and he asked the Mississippi railroad commissioners for "some efficient mode of supervision or regulation of rates" for intra-state commerce.¹⁵ He also worked long and hard

¹¹ *Congressional Record*, 49 Cong., 1 Sess., 154 (December 10, 1885); 49 Cong., 2 Sess., 730 (January 17, 1887), 1094 (January 27, 1887); *Jackson Clarion-Ledger*, June 27, 1889.

¹² Columbus (Miss.) *Patron of Husbandry*, March 11, 1882; James W. Garner, "The Senatorial Career of James Z. George," in *Mississippi Historical Society Publications* (Oxford-Jackson, 1898-1925), VII (1903), 247.

¹³ *Congressional Record*, 48 Cong., 1 Sess., 1346 (February 25, 1884); 50 Cong., 1 Sess., 8561 (September 13, 1888); 53 Cong., 1 Sess., 1722-23 (September 26, 1893).

¹⁴ He offered amendments providing that the act should not apply to agreements between laborers made with the view of lessening hours or increasing wages, nor to agreements or combinations among people engaged in agriculture with the view of enhancing the price of agricultural products. James Z. George, *The Political History of Slavery in the United States* (New York, 1915), xiv.

¹⁵ George to Mississippi Railroad Commissioners, in *Jackson Clarion*, February 2, 1887; *Jackson Clarion*, April 20, 1887. He was suspicious of the methods used by railroad officers

for a bankruptcy law, which he pushed through the Senate.¹⁶ He distrusted the centralized power and privileges of banks, vowing that he would not vote for any act which favored the banks at the expense of the people.¹⁷ Many of his Mississippi supporters were disappointed when he refused to support the sub-treasury scheme. He fought a political campaign largely on that issue, and won.¹⁸

George was one of the leaders in calling a convention in 1890 for the purpose of writing a new constitution to take the place of the one adopted during Reconstruction. He favored such action in 1888, and he urged it in 1889 in public speeches. The most pressing need, as he saw it, was the control of Negro suffrage, but he also wanted legislative curbs on corporations by means of repealable or amendable charters and by taxation of corporation property.¹⁹ George's hand may today be seen in those sections of the Mississippi constitution of 1890.²⁰

Senator Lamar was not a wealthy man, nor did he at any time after the war own considerable property. His sympathies, however, were with the well-to-do rather than the poor. He acknowledged his political debt to the farmers and he rhapsodized over the free landholder,²¹ but his course in Congress was frequently in accord with the interests of capitalists and corporations. He did not disapprove of, nor fear, corporations; on the contrary, he defended them. In his speech in Congress on the Texas Pacific Railroad he discussed the various benefits

to circumvent the law. See *Congressional Record*, 49 Cong., 2 Sess., 636 (January 14, 1887).

¹⁶ Garner, "Senatorial Career of James Z. George," *loc. cit.*, 250; *Congressional Record*, 48 Cong., 1 Sess., 3050 (April 17, 1884).

¹⁷ *Congressional Record*, 48 Cong., 1 Sess., 1342, 1346 (February 25, 1884); 53 Cong., 1 Sess., 1719 (September 26, 1893).

¹⁸ George, *Political History of Slavery*, xvii-xviii; Greenwood (Miss.) *Enterprise*, May 9, 1891.

¹⁹ Address by James Z. George, in Jackson *Clarion-Ledger*, October 24, 1889; Memphis *Appeal*, July 7, 1890; Yazoo City (Miss.) *Herald*, November 15, 1889; John R. Lynch, *The Facts of Reconstruction* (Chicago, 1913), 261-62.

²⁰ *Journal of the Proceedings of the Constitutional Convention of the State of Mississippi*, . . . August 12, 1890, . . . November 1, 1890 (Jackson, 1890), 344, 428, 663-68, and index under *Corporate Legislation*; Dunbar Rowland (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Mississippi History; Comprising Sketches of Counties, Towns, Events, Institutions and Persons*, 2 vols. (Madison, 1907), I, 539.

²¹ *Congressional Record*, 45 Cong., 2 Sess., 524 (January 24, 1878); 47 Cong., 2 Sess., 2194 (February 7, 1883).

which corporations had brought.²² Despite his admission in 1890 that "an unholy alliance between political power and organized capital" was developing, he denied that "plutocracy has this country in its grasp."²³ He invited eastern capital to the South, painting a glowing picture of the region's advantages in soil, climate, raw materials, minerals, forests, and labor supply. Before the South could develop the new markets of South and Central America, it must have connections with eastern markets by railroads, and it must have capital and skill, all of which he suggested that the East provide.²⁴ He wanted the South to turn away from its old ally, the West, and seek "friends and support" in the East.²⁵

Because of Lamar's monetary views, which were similar to those of eastern capitalists rather than southern debtor farmers, a clash occurred between him and the Mississippi legislature. In 1878 he was instructed by the legislature to vote for the Bland Silver Coinage Bill, then before Congress. Having studied the question thoroughly and decided on his position, he refused to obey the instructions and voted against the bill.²⁶ His farmer constituency was bitter against him and he had the hardest campaign of his career for re-election.

Again, Lamar was out of sympathy with many of his constituents as to the need for a state constitutional convention in 1890. His attitude was negative. He, moreover, saw changes in Mississippi farmers which he disapproved. He said that he had watched with "almost tremulous solicitude" the alterations "in the character, spirit, and purpose of the

²² *Ibid.*, 45 Cong., 2 Sess., 3658 (May 22, 1878).

²³ Alumni Address, Emory College, June 24, 1890, in Mayes, *Lucius Q. C. Lamar*, 802.

²⁴ *Congressional Record*, 45 Cong., 2 Sess., 3658 (May 22, 1878). One writer, of an anti-capitalist turn, asserted that Lamar was an "extensive railroad stockholder and a director of the Mississippi Central Railroad." Gustavus Myers, *History of the Supreme Court of the United States* (Chicago, 1912), 571-72. The Mississippi Central was only 236 miles long, deeply in debt, and in sad disrepair, so that his office as director for a few years after the war was not exactly desirable. The stock that he represented probably came to his family from his father-in-law, Augustus B. Longstreet, who had sold stock before the war when the railroad was being constructed.

²⁵ *Congressional Record*, 45 Cong., 2 Sess., 3658-59 (May 22, 1878); Lamar to John M. Allen, March 14, 1878 (letter in possession of Mrs. S. J. High, Tupelo, Mississippi).

²⁶ For a discussion of this fight, see Wirt A. Cate, *Lucius Q. C. Lamar; Secession and Reunion* (Chapel Hill, 1935), 304-24, which is based largely upon the more extended treatment in Mayes, *Lucius Q. C. Lamar*, 327-48, 394-411.

farmers of Mississippi" in the early 1890's. It seemed to him that they had accepted as their motive of political conduct "the selfish, ignoble idea of government—namely, a means of their own self-enrichment and aggrandizement." He considered the defeat of his old friend, Wade Hampton of South Carolina, to be shameful, and urged that all Mississippians should rally to re-elect Walthall.²⁷

Senator Edward C. Walthall was not only aristocratic by birth, but also well off financially. In the years following 1871, when most former Confederates were struggling for a scanty living, Walthall's wealth was "far above the average for the time and locality," though admittedly the time was difficult and the locality poor. His personal tax evaluation in 1880 was the highest of any in his town.²⁸ He was a railroad lawyer, an avowed friend of the railroads, and sympathetic with corporations. He voted for the Interstate Commerce Act, implying, however, that he thought the act unconstitutional. The farmers, as represented in the state Grange newspaper, disapproved of him.²⁹ Like Lamar, he opposed the constitutional convention of 1890, which he considered "an unnecessary, expensive and dangerous experiment." Fear of division among the Democrats and uncertainty as to the outcome were further reasons he gave for his active opposition.³⁰ On the monetary question, he approximated more or less the views of Mississippi farmers. Stating that he favored a conservative policy in regard to paper money, he declared that he was "a free silver man, open and decided."³¹

²⁷ Lamar to Walter Barker, 1891, in Mayes, *Lucius Q. C. Lamar*, 552-53; Lynch, *Facts of Reconstruction*, 261-62; Recollection of a conversation between R. A. Meek and James Z. George, in letter from R. A. Meek, Black Hawk, Mississippi, to author, February 13, 1933; Interview with D. M. Featherston, Holly Springs, Mississippi, July 13, 1934.

²⁸ Personal Tax Rolls, 1880, City of Grenada, Grenada County, Mississippi (Mississippi Department of Archives and History); Paul D. Hardin, "Edward Cary Walthall: A Mississippi Conservative" (M. A. thesis, Duke University, 1940), 53, 92-93, copy in Mississippi Department of Archives and History.

²⁹ Columbus *Patron of Husbandry*, January 10, 1880; *Congressional Record*, 49 Cong., 1 Sess., 4307-4309 (May 10, 1886); Hardin, "Edward Cary Walthall," 92-93.

³⁰ Speech of Walthall, in Jackson *Clarion-Ledger*, October 31, 1889; Yazoo City (Miss.) *Yazoo Sentinel*, November 7, 1889; Greenwood *Yazoo Valley Flag*, November 23, 1889; Lynch, *Facts of Reconstruction*, 261-62.

³¹ *Congressional Record*, 53 Cong., 1 Sess., 1231 (September 8, 1893); Port Gibson (Miss.) *Reveille*, quoted in Hardin, "Edward Cary Walthall," 107.

The small farmer and laborer in Mississippi not only had a representative in the Senate, but a friend also occupied the governor's chair. Of the two men who served as governors of Mississippi from 1876 to 1890, one of them, John M. Stone, rose by various occupations from a poor boy to the legal profession and the chief executive's office. He co-operated with the Bourbons and had their approval, but he was "nominated by farmers . . . and has been true and faithful to their interests," declared the farmers' newspaper.³² He later became railroad commissioner and banker, and then president of the agricultural college so dear to the farmers' hearts. His position in regard to a constitutional convention was favorable.³³

The other governor, Robert Lowry, also came from a poor family, and he, too, became a lawyer. He was unpopular with the farmers because of legislation which he promoted. Bills to exempt from taxation for ten years new railroads and factories and machinery used in cotton textile mills were fought and denounced by many farmers, but supported by Lowry.³⁴ He was generally considered a railroad man. Though he proposed the creation of a railroad commission for supervision of intra-state railroads, he vetoed the bill and it had to be modified to meet his approval.³⁵ When the legislature adopted a resolution in 1888 calling for a constitutional convention, Lowry vetoed it.³⁶

One of Mississippi's three senators and one of the state's two governors, therefore, were especially responsive to the needs of the farmers

³² Columbus *Patron of Husbandry*, July 9, 1881. Stone was governor from 1876 to 1882, and from 1890 to 1896.

³³ John S. McNeilly, "History of the Measures Submitted to the Committee on Elective Franchise, Apportionment, and Election in the Constitutional Convention of 1890," in *Mississippi Historical Society Publications*, VI (1902), 130.

³⁴ James S. Ferguson, "The Granger Movement in Mississippi" (M. A. thesis, Louisiana State University, 1940), 150-51, copy in Mississippi Department of Archives and History. Lowry was governor for two terms, from 1882 to 1890. In his first message to the legislature, Lowry welcomed the manufacturers, asserting that "The president or managers of a successful factory among us ought to be more highly appreciated and honored by us than any other public functionary in the land." Quoted in Dunbar Rowland, *History of Mississippi, the Heart of the South*, 2 vols. (Chicago, 1925), II, 224.

³⁵ Ferguson, "Granger Movement in Mississippi," 160; Rowland, *Mississippi, the Heart of the South*, II, 229.

³⁶ McNeilly, "History of Measures Submitted . . . in the Constitutional Convention of 1890," *loc. cit.*, 130; Greenwood *Yazoo Valley Flag*, January 28, 1888.

in the period of Bourbon supremacy. The question next arises as to the representation of the farmer group in the national House of Representatives. From 1876 to 1890 Mississippi elected seventeen Democratic and Alliance Congressmen. Several of these men apparently ran with both hare and hounds, the result being that it cannot be said that one was wholly pro-farmer and another wholly pro-Bourbon. Many Bourbons worked whole-heartedly and sincerely for the farmers' welfare. Ethelbert Barksdale, for example, who was editor of the state's leading newspaper, the Jackson *Clarion*, was an aristocrat and usually co-operated with the Bourbon leaders.³⁷ Yet he was lecturer for the Grange, ran a column of farm news in his paper, supported Grange policies, and was approved by the Grange newspaper.³⁸ In 1890 he was an Alliance candidate for Congress, and in 1892, he ran, on a sub-treasury platform, against George for the Senate.³⁹ Henry L. Muldrow's case was somewhat similar. He had the approval of Lamar as Congressman for several terms and he was Lamar's First Assistant Secretary of the Interior, but he ranked second only to James Z. George in the esteem of Mississippi farmers. The Grange's *Patron of Husbandry* declared that "his conspicuous advocacy of the rights and interests of the farmers, and his opposition to the Money Power, have attracted the attention of farmers throughout the Country."⁴⁰

The representatives who were approved by Bourbons but were known to be sympathetic with farmers numbered at least three. Then there were four others, elected late in the Bourbon period, whose chief loyalty was to the farmers. It may safely be concluded that seven of the seventeen representatives, whether Bourbons or not, were sympathetic toward

³⁷ For an account of Barksdale's attempt to obtain party leadership, see Willie D. Hallsell, "Democratic Dissensions in Mississippi, 1878-1882," in *Journal of Mississippi History* (Jackson, 1939-), II (1940), 123-35.

³⁸ James S. Ferguson, "The Grange and Farmer Education in Mississippi," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), VIII (1942), 508; Jackson *Clarion*, August 11, 1875.

³⁹ Greenwood *Delta Flag*, April 10, 1891; Rowland (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Mississippi History*, I, 213.

⁴⁰ Columbus *Patron of Husbandry*, July 24, 1880. For resolutions of approval by Granges, see *ibid.*, October 9, 1880; June 10, 1882.

the agricultural interests. Detailed study of the speeches and course of action of others might possibly show that more of them were friends of the farmers.

Another measure may be applied to determine the loyalties of the Mississippi representatives. Two authorities have used the professions of Congressmen (aside from politics) as a means of judging their sympathies, and the *Patron of Husbandry* considered lawyers as a whole unfriendly to the interest of farmers.⁴¹ This method, however, is subject to the same difficulty as that already discovered: the dividing line is not clear, and was not clear at that time. Fourteen of the seventeen representatives were lawyers. Four of these fourteen, however, were approved by the farmers. The three remaining representatives who followed other professions were positively on the farmers' side.⁴² According to this measure, seven representatives sympathized with, worked for, and were approved by the farmers. This conclusion is identical with that reached above.

In the Mississippi legislature, the house of representatives was controlled by farmers throughout the Bourbon period, to the extent that for five sessions they had more than twice the strength of their opponents. Even if the planters, who were more likely allied by class interest with the lawyer-politicians than with the farmers, be counted with the lawyer group, the farmers still had a large majority. The average number of lawyers was 28, of planters, 11, and of farmers, 61, with the representation of lawyers constantly diminishing.⁴³

The rival interests were more evenly matched in the state senate. There, farmer representation varied from a bare majority to less than one-half the number of lawyers. The average representation for five

⁴¹ Woodward, "Bourbonism in Georgia," *loc. cit.*, 28; Woodward, *Tom Watson*, 137; Arnett, *Populist Movement in Georgia*, 31-33; Columbus *Patron of Husbandry*, June 7, June 21, July 26, August 9, December 6, 1879.

⁴² Rowland (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Mississippi History*, I, 228, 497; II, 734; McCain, "Populist Party in Mississippi," 1.

⁴³ *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi at a Regular Session* (Jackson, 1878), 616-21; Jackson *Clarion*, February 2, 1878; *Journal of the Senate of the State of Mississippi at a Regular Session Thereof, 1880* (Jackson, 1880), 581-85; *ibid.*, 1884, 641-45; *ibid.*, 1888, 604-608; *ibid.*, 1890, 500-505.

sessions was 18 lawyers, 5 planters, 16 farmers.⁴⁴ An aristocratic observer who was a veteran in state affairs indicated his impression of the composition of the state legislature when he referred to the members as "old, long eared Grangers."⁴⁵

Further evidence of their strength may be found in the composition of the constitutional convention of 1890, which was summoned partly as a result of the pressure of farmers. After ruling out those members who could not with certainty be placed in either group, the remainder of the membership was composed of 52 lawyers, 7 planters, and 42 farmers.⁴⁶ From the foregoing figures, therefore, it may be concluded that the farmers and laborers of Mississippi were neither ignored nor overridden during the Bourbon period. One of the three United States senators worked for their interests largely; on their side also were one of the two governors, seven of the seventeen Congressmen, a constantly favorable lower house in the state legislature, and sometimes a near equality in the state senate.

It is true that Mississippi farmers did not elect pure pro-farmer candidates until near the close of the period. The most prominent farm leaders, Frank Burkitt and Putnam Darden (state Grange Master), occupied no political offices of major importance.⁴⁷ The politically unorganized farmers worked along with and voted for the Bourbons. Convincing evidence of their lack of unity and their submission to the Democratic party organization is to be found in the votes cast by the Mississippi legislature at the elections of senators. The farmers had a majority in the legislature, but the recorded vote was consistently a large, almost unanimous, vote for the Democratic candidate and a small scattering vote for the Republican candidate.⁴⁸ Nor was there conflict

⁴⁴ *Journal of the Senate of Mississippi*, 1880, 580-81; *ibid.*, 1884, 640-41; *ibid.*, 1888, 602-603; *ibid.*, 1890, 498-99; Jackson *Clarion*, January 17, 1878.

⁴⁵ James L. Alcorn to his daughter, Mary, February 3, 1882, in Alcorn Papers (Mississippi Department of Archives and History).

⁴⁶ *Journal of Constitutional Convention of 1890*, 704-708. A few members listed themselves as "lawyer-farmers." For obvious reasons these are not counted in either group.

⁴⁷ Darden was at one time a member of the lower house of the state legislature. Rowland, *Mississippi, the Heart of the South*, II, 231.

⁴⁸ *Journal of the Senate of the State of Mississippi at Regular Session*, 1876 (Jackson, 1876), 95, 105; *Memphis Appeal*, January 23, 1880; *Raymond Hinds County Gazette*, January 25, 1882; *Macon Mississippi Sun*, January 22, 1882.

between class candidates in the Democratic caucuses preceding the senatorial elections.⁴⁹ It may be safely said that until near the end of the Bourbon period the farmers were generally content to accept the so-called Bourbon senators and representatives, judging by the instructions of county conventions and by party caucuses; or, if unwilling, they did not make their influence felt through those two channels. There is the possibility, also, that their opposition disappeared within the deep, dark intricacies of the local and state Democratic machinery.

An effective weapon that the farmers directed against the Bourbon officeholders was the state Grange newspaper, the *Patron of Husbandry*. Bourbons thought not to be working for the interests of farmers were attacked in a most articulate and devastating fashion by the editor. He called the turns: thumbs up for Stone, Muldrow, George, and Singleton; thumbs down for Lamar, Walthall, and Lowry.⁵⁰ The paper railed against the lawyer-politicians, the courthouse rings, the professional politicians, and urged the farmers to elect farmers—Republicans, Democrats, or Greenbackers, but farmers first.⁵¹

Other opposition to the Bourbons and their policies appeared in the Greenback party. Though the Greenbackers were neither strong nor numerous, the organization of the party signified the existence of opinion against "corporate aggressiveness" as well as dissatisfaction with monetary policies. Out of this party developed pressure for state supervision of railroad rates.⁵² The Greenback party reached its greatest strength when in the gubernatorial election of 1881 its candidate won 52,009 votes to the Democratic nominee's 77,501.⁵³

In addition to opposition to Bourbon leadership and policies as shown in the Grange newspaper, the Greenback party, and dissatisfied

⁴⁹ Jackson *Clarion*, January 7, 1876; January 20, 21, 1880; Jackson *Times*, January 7, 1876; Jackson *Comet*, January 31, 1880; Macon *Mississippi Sun*, January 20, 1882; Greenwood *Yazoo Valley Flag*, January 16, 1886.

⁵⁰ Columbus *Patron of Husbandry*, June 7, June 21, July 9, July 12, 1879; January 1, July 24, October 9, 1880; November 5, 1881; February 11, March 11, March 18, June 10, 1882.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, May 3, May 24, May 31, June 7, June 21, July 12, July 26, August 9, December 6, 1879; June 18, 1881.

⁵² Rowland (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Mississippi History*, II, 742.

⁵³ Rowland, *Mississippi, the Heart of the South*, II, 220.

Democrats who called themselves Independents, there were still other signs of resistance within the Democratic party. The first attack made indirectly against the Bourbons consisted of the legislative instructions to Senator Lamar on the silver bill. Though he was later re-elected to the Senate despite his refusal to obey instructions, the fact was obvious that the dissatisfied legislators, whatever their political affiliations, were strong enough to force through both houses of the Mississippi legislature over determined opposition a resolution that was hostile to Lamar's and the capitalists' gold views.

In 1880, 1881, and 1882, insurgent Bourbons gained sufficient strength within and outside the party to force bitter battles in the Democracy. All the rebellions failed except that led by James R. Chalmers, who with the help of Independents, Greenbackers, and Republicans was elected to Congress from the very district in which Senator Lamar resided.⁵⁴ The election of one Alliance Congressman in 1888 and two in 1890 showed that the hold of the Bourbons was slipping, and a high point of opposition to conservative Bourbonism was reached in the summoning of the constitutional convention.

That Mississippi farmers had grounds for dissatisfaction and complaint is evident from the deterioration of their economic status. A few facts may indicate their condition. From 1880 to 1889 the number of recorded mortgages in Mississippi climbed steadily from about 4,800 to nearly 11,250.⁵⁵ Furthermore, the percentage of farms operated by owners decreased by 1890 to the lowest point of all but one of the southern states.⁵⁶ The price of cotton fluctuated at a low level, and while the lien merchant rose in prosperity, the farmer sank further into the slough of economic despondency.

But at the same time, Mississippi farmers were obtaining a considerable part of the legislation they demanded. The *Patron of Husbandry*, other sympathetic editors, and Granges urged such reforms as the direct

⁵⁴ Chalmers, however, was not the farmers' candidate. See Willie D. Halsell, "James R. Chalmers and 'Mahoneism' in Mississippi," in *Journal of Southern History*, X (1944), 43.

⁵⁵ *Compendium of the Eleventh Census: 1890*, 3 vols. (Washington, 1892-1897), III, 1032.

⁵⁶ Benjamin B. Kendrick and Alex M. Arnett, *The South Looks at Its Past* (Chapel Hill, 1935), 118.

election of senators, a state constitutional convention, repeal of the agricultural lien law, a three-wire fence law, measures to protect contracts between landlords and tenants, an elective judiciary, limitation on acceptance of railroad passes by public officials, the creation of a state regulatory railroad commission, protection of farmers against the encroachments of monopolies and corporations, the establishment of an agricultural and mechanical college for boys, and an industrial institute and college for girls. Many of these reforms were brought about before the end of the Bourbon period, all of them eventually.⁵⁷

In Georgia, the political dominance of the Bourbons was characterized and immensely strengthened by the development of industries and enterprises which they encouraged and sometimes led. Mississippi, also, was undergoing a degree of industrial change at the same time. The four largest manufacturing industries in Mississippi in 1890, judging by their capital and total value of products, were lumber mills; oil, cottonseed, and cake mills; cotton textile mills; and railroad shop construction and repair work. The sawmills led the others in estimated capital invested, nearly \$4,500,000; in number of employees; and in value of their products; but they had only doubled this value since 1870.⁵⁸ The nine textile mills showed a valuation of products double that of 1880 and six times the value of 1870. The number of spindles more than tripled between 1880 and 1890, and multiplied sixteen times in the twenty years before 1890.⁵⁹ Railroad mileage also expanded at a rapid rate in the decade before 1890, the percentage of increase in Mississippi being as high as 108.4.⁶⁰

Despite all these gains, Mississippi's industrial advance was, on the whole, not as rapid as that of the states in the vanguard of the New South. While Mississippi multiplied its industrial capital three times,

⁵⁷ Columbus *Patron of Husbandry*, May 3, August 9, 1879; Rowland (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Mississippi History*, II, 141; Ferguson, "The Grange and Farmer Education in Mississippi," *loc. cit.*, 502-505; Ferguson, "Granger Movement in Mississippi," 146-60.

⁵⁸ For information on the development of the lumber business in Mississippi, see Paul W. Gates, "Federal Land Policy in the South, 1866-1888," in *Journal of Southern History*, VI (1940), 315-30.

⁵⁹ *Eleventh Census of the United States, 1890: Manufactures*, 3 vols. (Washington, 1896), I, 68, 482-85; III, 190-91, 610.

⁶⁰ *Eleventh Census, 1890: Transportation*, 2 vols. (Washington, 1894-1895), I, 4.

various other southern states multiplied theirs from three to twenty times.⁶¹ Mississippians pointed with pride to their textile mills with products valued six times greater than in 1870, but several other states were far ahead. The increase in the state's railroad mileage, while considerable, was not the greatest in the South.

Because it lacked water power and minerals, the state remained largely agricultural, and only a small proportion of the population earned their living in manufacturing enterprises. The number of farms doubled in the twenty years, about 4,500,000 acres being added to farm lands, and the average size of farms decreased from 193 to 122 acres. The building of railroads aided in opening up new regions for agriculture, as, for example, the construction of the Georgia Pacific across the fertile Yazoo-Mississippi delta, while lumber companies cleared many an acre for farm lands. The value of farm products in 1890, a year of temporary losses and low prices, was still four times as great as the value of manufactured goods for 1890.⁶²

No city in Mississippi held a position similar to that of Atlanta in Georgia as leader of the state's industrial advance. Development instead was regional. If a line were drawn across Mississippi from Warren County eastward so as to include Lauderdale County, there would be contained in this southern third of the state nine of the ten counties that valued their manufactured products at more than \$500,000 in 1890.⁶³ Furthermore, the Bourbon leaders in Mississippi at no time had the economic power of their political counterparts in Georgia. No important Mississippi Bourbon politician was prominently or closely connected with railroad building or major factories or other large industrial enterprises. In fact, the hold of the Bourbons on Mississippi was largely political. The state produced no Henry W. Grady to lead or to justify its industrialization. Indeed, compared with Georgia, there was little to be led or justified. Whatever Mississippi's subsequent position in the pilgrimage to the goal of the New South and however desirable it may

⁶¹ *Compendium of Eleventh Census: 1890*, III, 670.

⁶² *Eleventh Census, 1890: Agriculture* (Washington, 1894), 156-57, 215.

⁶³ *Eleventh Census, 1890: Manufactures*, I, 484-87.

have seemed to attain that goal, the state was still in a relatively "backward" condition in 1890.

Perhaps for the same reasons, Mississippi produced no Tom Watson or Ben Tillman. Certainly, the facts that the "little man" had representation in the United States Senate and House of Representatives, in the governor's mansion, and in both houses of the state legislature, and that he obtained a considerable portion of the legislation he asked for, helped Mississippi through the troubled 1890's without the violent political upheavals experienced in several other southern states.

Compared with the versatile and successful Georgia Bourbons, the Mississippi Bourbons were but pale replicas. In Mississippi the three strongest Bourbons did not—they dared not—swap around the foremost federal and state offices, as was done in Georgia. The only remotely parallel instance in Mississippi was when Lamar, upon entering Cleveland's cabinet, saw that Walthall was appointed by Governor Lowry to succeed him as senator. Lamar's motive appears to have been friendship rather than anything more subtle.⁶⁴

Factors making for unity under the Mississippi Bourbons were white supremacy and party regularity, the double heritage of Reconstruction. This heritage the farmers did not wish to cast aside. Furthermore, the dearth of able leaders and the lack of unity in the opposing groups were contributing reasons for their failure to break the long and successful rule of the Bourbons. Not only did the individualistic farmers fail to unite, they even stated that they did not wish to form a third party. In some states they wanted to capture the Democratic party, but in Mississippi such was not the case. One of the leaders of Mississippi farmers revealed their political philosophy when he gave his reasons for not forming or joining a third party. Claiming that nine-tenths of the Mississippi Alliance men agreed with him, he said:

I am an Alliance man. . . . But I am a Democrat, and I am constrained to believe that the grand old party, which has always been the party of the people, will furnish us the relief offered. I prefer to abide its action, rather than form new political affiliations. The Southern Alliance man is naturally a Democrat. He is

⁶⁴ Greenwood *Yazoo Valley Flag*, March 14, 1885; Robert H. Henry, *Editors I Have Known since the Civil War* (Jackson, 1922), 97.

confronted with such dangers locally that he cannot afford to engage in the third party experiment or look with favor upon a movement calculated to divide the white people. He is a reformer, but he proposes to effect the desired reforms through the party of his fathers.⁶⁵

As a result of this policy in Mississippi, the Alliance men and their successors were in time absorbed into the Democratic party. By 1890, younger men with new philosophies had begun to take over the Democracy from the Bourbons, although a number of Bourbons continued in office for years. Bourbonism had achieved some of its objectives, but less fully in Mississippi than in other southern states.

⁶⁵ Greenwood *Enterprise*, March 11, 1892. See also John D. Hicks, *The Populist Revolt* (Minneapolis, 1931), 170.

Notes and Documents

CHARLESTON THEATRICALS DURING THE TRAGIC DECADE, 1860-1869

BY W. STANLEY HOOLE

Students of Charleston history during and immediately following the Civil War have long painted a desolate picture of attack, siege, bombardment, blockade, death, destruction by fire, surrender, and, finally, occupation by Federal forces. These truths and others equally disconsolate no one doubts. Yet there was a brighter, cheerier side. Amid their sufferings Charlestonians remained calm, eagerly determined to catch the few remaining pleasures life held out for them. Chief among these was the drama. Indeed, a century and a quarter of theatrical and musical tradition lay behind the thinking of these Carolinians, charting their course; in spite of war and its evils the show had to go on. That it did go on will ever be a tribute to the gallant city and a fighting people. This paper is an attempt to present a record of that fight for amusement during an otherwise bleak and dreary and tragic decade.¹

During its last season, October-December, 1861, the twenty-four-year-old Charleston Theatre, generally recognized as one of the finest theatres in America, played but a minor role in the city's cultural activities.² Too many and weighty were the tragedies of real life in these stirring days for Charlestonians to be greatly concerned with make-

¹ This article is a by-product of a study, *The Ante-Bellum Charleston Theatre* (1800-1861), completed by the author under a grant-in-aid from the Rockefeller Foundation, and now in press.

² The theatrical "season" usually lasted from October through May, ending as the hot weather began.

believe. Only a year before, on December 20, 1860, South Carolina had seceded from the Union. In January of the next year the *Star of the West* had been fired upon as she attempted to reinforce Major Robert Anderson's Federal garrison in Fort Sumter. Three months later General Pierre G. T. Beauregard had arrived to assume command of the Confederate military. In April the historic attack on Fort Sumter had begun; and in May the beleaguered seaport had been blockaded by the U.S.S. *Niagara* and twenty-four men-of-war. Meanwhile, ladies' volunteer organizations knitted, sewed, and cared for the wounded. Troops arrived daily from up-state, left daily for the battlefields of Virginia. War words filled the *Courier* and the *Mercury*: reports of conflict, casualty lists, a new Congress, a new flag. And in mid-November had come news that Port Royal, fifty miles down the sea-coast, had been captured by General Thomas W. Sherman. Invasion of Charleston was imminent. There was little thought for the closed theatre on Meeting Street.

Bravely, however, G. F. Marchant decided to carry on the show. Since 1857 he had managed the Charleston, bringing to its stage such famous players as Edwin Booth, Fanny Davenport, James E. Murdock, Julia Dean, Adelina Patti, Adelaide Phillips, William E. Burton, and Edward A. Sothorn. Now, as the dark clouds of war hung oppressively low over the city, Manager Marchant believed more than ever that his fellow citizens needed and wanted amusement. On October 15, 1861, therefore, he opened the Charleston for its twenty-fourth year, presenting the Savannah quartette "in aid of the sick and wounded soldiers." A week later the Thespian Family played *Troubadour Soldier*, *Une Fille Terrible!*, and *Soldier and Boarder* "for the benefit of the Irish Volunteers." Following them came the Zouaves, French soldiers of the Crimea, who on six consecutive nights performed *Les Deux Avengees*, *Les Folies Dramatiques*, and *The Barber of Seville* to "fair-sized audiences." On November 30 a short drama, appropriately entitled *The Battalion of Forlorn Hope*, was offered, and as an added attraction the Charleston Volunteers did "fancy drills upon the stage." But these attempts were only partly successful and Marchant, his

finger close on the public pulse, closed the Charleston for a brief recess.

Eleven days later, on December 11, the Charleston Theatre, made famous by the Booths, the Wallacks, Jenny Lind, Anna Cora Mowatt, William Macready, Edmund Kean, and other internationally beloved celebrities of the stage,³ was destroyed by fire. With the theatre went one-third of the entire city: Cameron's Foundry containing an immense store of ammunition, the Art Gallery, the famous Circular Church, Apprentice Library, Institute Hall, St. Finbar's Cathedral, and hundreds of other buildings and dwellings.⁴

Amid such tragedy it seems incredible that Charlestonians would still have demanded theatricals. But within three months after the great fire, while much of the city was yet an ash-piled ruin, Hibernian Hall on Meeting Street was being remodeled into a playhouse. On March 20, 1862, the old building, now renamed Hibernian Theatre, was formally opened by Reeves' Musical Festival Company. Blind Tom, the Inspired Musician, came after the Reeves cast left, and in April Johnson's New Orleans Minstrels, Burlesque Opera Troupe and Brass Band. Marchant, erstwhile lessee of the Charleston, frequently volunteered his services and, besides "musical and intellectual entertainments," many attempts were made by the managers to attract crowds with showings of "War Illustrations" and "Views of Battles."

But war was reaching ever closer to the besieged city. Naval and land engagements had brought shell fire within hearing distance. In June, 1862, Confederates and Federals fought the battle of Secessionville on James Island, only ten miles away. By July of the next year Union troops had captured Morris Island and Rear Admiral John B. A. Dahlgren had demolished Fort Sumter; and in August General Quincy A. Gillmore, reinforced by 3,000 fresh troops, had begun installation of the famous "Swamp Angel," a powerful eight-inch cannon capable of hurling 200-pound shells into the heart of Charleston itself. Surrounded by such a ring of fire the city was doomed. Doggedly, however, it held on. Not until February 17, 1865,

³ W. Stanley Hoole, "Charleston Theatres," in *Southwest Review* (Austin, Dallas, 1915-), XXV (1939-1940), 193-204.

⁴ *Charleston Courier*, December 12, 1861. The fire was not caused by the war.

after a siege of 567 days, did the Confederates evacuate and Mayor Charles Macbeth surrender the seaport to Lieutenant Colonel Augustus G. Bennett.⁵

Meanwhile, during the siege, the Hibernian remained open, offering miscellaneous diversion for the stricken citizens. John Sloman, beloved for his comic songs in pre-war days, presented infrequent musical concerts. As late as the fall of 1864 he and his daughters attracted small audiences—with tickets five dollars each. And there were many showings of panoramic war views, band concerts, several dress balls, and “music festivals.”

With the lifting of the siege and the arrival of the Federal garrison of occupation came a renewed interest in the drama. In less than six weeks the editor of the *Courier*, writing under severe military censorship, advised Charlestonians that theatricals were returning. “With the permission of the Military” C. G. Strahan and George S. Parkes, producers from New York,⁶ were on their way to “revive drama in our midst.” Arriving on March 27, Strahan and Parkes brought a cast of sixteen players, including George L. Aiken, S. T. Clare, J. L. Fendall, Charles H. Howard, Georgianna and Lotty Langley, Lizzie Holmes, Laura Desmond, James Duff, and Annie Tillie.⁷

The managers, finding little favor with the incommodious Hibernian, secured permission from Lieutenant Colonel Bennett to use the German Artillery Hall, on Wentworth Street, one-time proud home of the Fourth Brigade of St. Philip’s and St. Michael’s parishes. For nearly three weeks “the enterprising managers and proprietors” were “busily engaged in repairing and refitting the Hall for theatrical purposes.” Meanwhile, a pleasure-hungry population composed of white citizens under “military surveillance,” freed Negroes, and Union soldiers, eagerly awaited the “grand opening.” “We have not the least doubt that [the managers] will be amply rewarded for their labors

⁵ *Ibid.*, February 18-20, 1865.

⁶ Parkes later made his New York debut at the Winter Garden Theatre and subsequently became famous at Augustin Daly’s Fifth Avenue Theatre. See George C. D. Odell, *Annals of the New York Stage*, 14 vols. to date (New York, 1927-), VIII, 20, 579 ff.

⁷ *Charleston Courier*, April 1, 1865.

by a succession of crowded house," stated the *Courier*, "for the people of Charleston desire amusement, and now they have an opportunity of gratifying their tastes."⁸

Advertising "New Theatre! New Scenery!! New Company!!!" and offering "Front seats \$1, Parquette 75c, Colored seats 50c," Strahan and Parkes raised their post-war curtain on April 12, 1865, only three days after General Lee's surrender at Appomattox. The play was *The Honeymoon*—the same comedy that twenty-eight years before, in the peaceful, prosperous days of 1837, had christened the Charleston Theatre. Said the *Courier* the next morning: "The Theatre opened last evening under favorable auspices. There was a large attendance, nearly every seat being occupied. The various characters throughout were admirably performed, and elicited much applause and frequent presents of bouquets thrown on the stage to the several actors engaged."

Night after night, from April 12 to July 10, Strahan and Parkes kept Artillery Hall Theatre open and, if the censored *Courier* may be taken literally, with great success. Frequent editorials attested to the popularity of the players and such comments as "complete and gratifying success" and "the house was well filled" were plentiful. Occasionally, the managers, "with permission of the Military," presented added attractions. On May 9 the 127th New York Volunteers Band gave a concert "for the poor of Charleston"; on May 26 L. I. Woolfe, "a celebrated Southerner just arrived," played *Don Caesar de Bazan*; and on June 17 James Walker, "celebrated jig dancer of the 54th Massachusetts Volunteers," danced between the acts of the Monrovia Sereaders' concert.⁹

Strahan and Parkes continually varied their offerings. Such dramatic favorites as *The Little Treasure*, *Retribution*, *Time Tries All*, *Still Waters Run Deep*, *Nora Creina*, *The Maid of Croissey*, *Robert Macaire*, *Somebody Else*, *Captain of the Watch*, and *The Rival Pages* were most popular and allegedly attracted fair patronage. But in spite of newspaper advertisements and complimentary notices, legitimate drama

⁸ *Ibid.*, April 12, 1865.

⁹ *Ibid.*, May 9-10, 26, June 17, 1865.

soon gave way to minstrels, and during the summer and fall Artillery Hall was frequently occupied by burlesques, serenaders, tamborinists, and "bone players." Indeed, it is not unlikely that the many circuses which came in rapid succession to Citadel Square did a far better business than the theatre.¹⁰

Between 1866 and 1869, as Charleston slowly regained its financial footing and citizens looked to a peaceful future, Hibernian Hall was again converted into a theatre. Called variously "Charleston Theatre," "The New Canterbury Theatre," and "The Metropolitan Theatre," it served for several years as the city's only playhouse. Early in 1866 Ghioni and Susini's Grand Italian Opera Troupe presented *Il Trovatore*, *Martha*, *Ernani*, *The Barber of Seville*, and *Norma*.¹¹ In the fall the company returned and shortly afterward came Leonard Grover's Grand Opera Company.¹² Meanwhile, there were many other attractions: musical and panoramic exhibitions, wizards, Barnum's History Museum, acrobats, and on Citadel Green the inevitable circuses. But it was not until November, 1867, that legitimate drama reappeared at the Hibernian, now called "The Charleston Theatre." John Templeton, "of the Savannah and Vicksburg theatres," with a cast of twenty-nine players ("the best Company in the South") opened on the eighteenth with *Little Barefoot*. Presenting *The Heir at Law*, *Black Crook*, *Seven Sisters*, and other current favorites, and featuring Isabel and Alice Vane in dances, the Templeton cast fared well for three weeks. Then it left for a tour of "other Southern theatres." On February 3, 1868, the Templetons returned for a winter engagement which lasted until May 1. Again starring the Vanes, Mr. and Mrs. Howard Watkins, and Mary Gladstone, the company returned in October for a third season which lasted until November 23.¹³ The John V. Gilbert Dramatic Company came next to present *Under the Gaslight*, *East Lynne*, *Leah the For-*

¹⁰ Artillery Hall was not used again as a theatre. It was dismantled in 1930. *Charleston Courier*, January 26, 1930.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, March 12-16, 1866.

¹² *Ibid.*, November 20-24, 1866.

¹³ The Templeton Company's repertoire included *Fancion the Cricket*, *Camille*, *Hidden Band*, *Trodden Down*, *Arrah of the Kiss*, *Black Flag*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Little Barefoot*, *Pocahontas*, and other popular mid-century dramas and comedies.

saken, and *Ten Nights in a Bar Room*, November 23-27. Enthusiastically received, this cast came back in January, 1869, and remained a month. The editor of the *Courier* praised Gilbert highly for "re-establishing the drama in our midst."¹⁴ Late in February Templeton again renewed his lease on the Hibernian, brought Whitman's Celebrated Parisian Ballet Troupe and a "\$15,000 Great Transformation Scene," and featured "the world's greatest spectacle, *The White Fawn*." Following the *Fawn*, which ran nine consecutive nights to packed houses, Templeton presented Marie Frederici's Grand German Opera Troupe in *Martha*, *Diavolo*, *Der Freyschutz*, *Faust*, *The Magic Flute*, and *Il Trovatore*. Nightly, reported the *Courier*, the house was filled to capacity.¹⁵ In April Manager Templeton engaged the Grand Female Operetta Company, the English Opera Bouffe, the Grand German Opera Company, and Whitman's Ballet Troupe in rapid succession, bringing the successful season to a close in May.

In the fall of 1869 the Hibernian, this time advertised as "The Metropolitan Theatre," was leased by Collins and Morse, theatrical agents, who began their season on October 4 with *The Ticket of Leave Man*. With a large cast, including Walter Benn, Mark Read, and Kate Raymond, the new company performed regularly until early in November. At that time, according to the *Courier*, a misunderstanding developed among the cast members and the company was disbanded.¹⁶

It was now apparent that Charleston was slowly regaining its position in the world of lights and shadows. With a long and excellent theatrical tradition to uphold, however, much remained to be done. Everyone realized that prestige could not be fully restored until the city had better, modern accommodations to offer the traveling stage companies. Much dissatisfaction had been expressed concerning the inadequacy of Hibernian Hall as a proper place for drama and opera. It was too small, seating only about six hundred people; it had none of the new and better stage equipment. As early as March 14, 1866,

¹⁴ Charleston *Courier*, February 1, 1869.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, March 5, 1869.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, November 2, 1869.

while Ghioni and Susini's Opera Troupe was nightly filling the small hall, the *Courier* had stated:

The presence of an Opera Troupe in this community at this time is somewhat of an uncommon event. All of five years have passed since we have been favored with the theatrical or operatic entertainment of a *recherche* order. This is not because the citizens of Charleston have lost any of their old taste for the refined and beautiful in the musical art, but on account of the depleted and desolated condition into which the city has been plunged by the circumstances of war. . . . The troupe [now playing] possess ability and talent, but it is like hiding a candle under a bushel to place them in Hibernian Hall. What we want in this city is an Academy of Music, constructed on modern principles. . . . The merchants of Charleston cannot afford to allow the city to become dull, stupid and shunned on account of a lack of attention and refined amusements. By all means give us an Academy of Music!!¹⁷

Such an attitude was quite understandable. For more than a hundred years Charleston had been the South's leading theatrical center. Regularly, year after year, especially after 1800, leading European and American actors had visited the city. The first Charleston Theatre, erected in 1793, had been the finest south of Philadelphia; the second Charleston, built in 1837, was unsurpassed in America.¹⁸ Each had had a seating capacity of 1,200. But the Hibernian, a makeshift, was in no way comparable to its predecessors. It is not surprising that Charlestonians were reluctant to let their theatricals remain "dull, stupid and shunned."

Late in the summer of 1869 the decision was reached: a new theatre, the Charleston Opera House, was to be built on the corner of King and Market streets. Plans drawn by John A. Devereaux for John Chadwick, the owner, called for a \$35,000 remodeling of the \$160,000 Adger Building into a theatre similar to Booth's Theatre in New York. Seating 1,200 people, the building was to contain a dress circle, a family circle, parquette, orchestra, and gallery, all "in the shape of a horseshoe." The stage, a copy of Brougham's Fifth Avenue Theatre and designed to be "quite as large as the stages of the principal stages

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, March 14, 1866.

¹⁸ W. Stanley Hoole, "Two Famous Theatres of the Old South," in *South Atlantic Quarterly* (Durham, 1902-), XXXVI (1937), 233-37.

in the North," was to be forty-five feet deep, fifty-four feet wide, and the proscenium opening thirty by forty feet. Over all there was to be grandeur of appointment in keeping with the nation's best theatrical practices—frescoed ceiling, red plush velvet seats, and delicately hued walls.¹⁹ Indeed, it was designed as "one of the handsomest theatres between Baltimore and New Orleans."²⁰

Amid appropriate ceremonies Chadwick laid the first brick of the new structure on September 6. On November 29 the *Courier* proudly announced that the theatre, its name changed to the Academy of Music, had been leased by John T. Ford of Holliday Street Theatre, Baltimore, and that for the formal opening, on December 1, Thomas W. Robertson's popular comedy, *School*, "as produced at Wallack's Theatre, New York," had been selected.²¹

The first performance was a tremendous success. A dedicatory address, written by the city's distinguished William Gilmore Simms, was spoken by Miss Lillie Eldridge, a cast-member,²² and programs were printed on sheets of silk cloth! *School* proved "a brilliant inauguration of the dramatic season." Among the players were Laura Alexander, Harry H. Wood, and James O'Neill, later to become world-famous as the *Count of Monte Cristo*. Complimenting the manager, the cast, the performance, the "attentive and polite ushers," and the acoustics, the next morning's *Courier* reviewed the production of *School* as follows:

Never since the dark clouds of war passed from our beloved country have we ever witnessed so large, so enthusiastic, and so brilliant an assemblage of ladies and gentlemen, as—notwithstanding the very inclement weather—filled the new Academy of Music last evening. Every seat had an occupant; the boxes were filled, the stalls occupied, the galleries and dress circles bore their teeming crowds—men were sandwiched in the passageways and clung to the pillars to obtain standing positions; and yet, notwithstanding that, it had been

¹⁹ Charleston *Courier*, September 7, 1869.

²⁰ Mary C. Owens, *Memories of the Professional and Social Life of John E. Owens* (Baltimore, 1892), 239-41.

²¹ Odell, *Annals of the New York Stage*, VIII, 419.

²² It is interesting to note that Simms also wrote the dedicatory poem for the opening of the Charleston Theatre, December 15, 1837. See Charleston *Courier*, December 18, 1837.

repeated with many wise shakes of the head by every old fogey in town, that the building was bound to fall in, that it was not strong enough.²³

The tragic decade had ended; the drama had returned to Charleston. From December 1, 1869, throughout the bitter days of Reconstruction and on until after the turn of the nineteenth century, the Academy of Music held its place as a leading theatrical center of the South. Season after season eminent actors and actresses played upon its boards—Laura Keane, Neil Warner, James H. Hackett, Edwin Forrest, Junius Brutus Booth, Lawrence Barrett, Joseph Jefferson, Fanny Davenport, Kate Putnam, Dion Boucicault, Robert Mantell, Henry Irving, Ellen Terry, John Drew, Sarah Bernhardt, and many more—presenting the finest in American dramatic and operatic entertainment.²⁴ Not until 1936, after sixty-seven years of service, was the Academy finally razed to make room for a modern structure.²⁵

AN INTERVIEW WITH GENERAL JUBAL A. EARLY IN 1889

EDITED BY MARTIN F. SCHMITT

General Jubal Anderson Early, C. S. A., is gradually becoming a figure in American folklore. His actual accomplishments as a military leader are solidly established by his own testimony, by the writings of his associates and opponents, and by military histories of the Civil War. His military career, however, has gathered about it an aura of fancy, a constellation of legend in which "Jube" is the central figure, the only point of stories which the veterans tell. The battle of Washington, and the campaigns in the Shenandoah Valley were well suited to produce a folklore. Jubal Early was always on the move, always unexpected, and almost always heroic, even in defeat.

It was not always so. By the spring of 1865, popular opposition had become so great because of his reverses in the Valley campaign that

²³ Charleston *Courier*, December 2, 1869.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, March 12, 1916; October 12, 18, 25, November 1, 1936.

²⁵ Charleston *Evening Post*, December 19, 1936.

repeated with many wise shakes of the head by every old fogey in town, that the building was bound to fall in, that it was not strong enough.²³

The tragic decade had ended; the drama had returned to Charleston. From December 1, 1869, throughout the bitter days of Reconstruction and on until after the turn of the nineteenth century, the Academy of Music held its place as a leading theatrical center of the South. Season after season eminent actors and actresses played upon its boards—Laura Keane, Neil Warner, James H. Hackett, Edwin Forrest, Junius Brutus Booth, Lawrence Barrett, Joseph Jefferson, Fanny Davenport, Kate Putnam, Dion Boucicault, Robert Mantell, Henry Irving, Ellen Terry, John Drew, Sarah Bernhardt, and many more—presenting the finest in American dramatic and operatic entertainment.²⁴ Not until 1936, after sixty-seven years of service, was the Academy finally razed to make room for a modern structure.²⁵

AN INTERVIEW WITH GENERAL JUBAL A. EARLY IN 1889

EDITED BY MARTIN F. SCHMITT

General Jubal Anderson Early, C. S. A., is gradually becoming a figure in American folklore. His actual accomplishments as a military leader are solidly established by his own testimony, by the writings of his associates and opponents, and by military histories of the Civil War. His military career, however, has gathered about it an aura of fancy, a constellation of legend in which "Jube" is the central figure, the only point of stories which the veterans tell. The battle of Washington, and the campaigns in the Shenandoah Valley were well suited to produce a folklore. Jubal Early was always on the move, always unexpected, and almost always heroic, even in defeat.

It was not always so. By the spring of 1865, popular opposition had become so great because of his reverses in the Valley campaign that

²³ Charleston *Courier*, December 2, 1869.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, March 12, 1916; October 12, 18, 25, November 1, 1936.

²⁵ Charleston *Evening Post*, December 19, 1936.

General Lee was forced to remove him from command to help restore public confidence in the army. Immediately following the collapse of the Army of Virginia, therefore, he continued to be unpopular in the South, though still feared in the North, which always thought of him in terms of the march on Washington. After Appomattox he fled south with an idea of joining General E. Kirby Smith in Texas and continuing the fight. His plan was frustrated by Smith's capitulation, and he continued on to Mexico. Later he went by boat to Canada, intending to remain out of the United States. There he wrote and first published his violent *Memoir*¹ which set the stage for the character he later assumed with increasing fervor, and to increasing applause.

General Early returned to Lynchburg in 1869, and resumed his law practice. Here he found an audience of fellow-soldiers who were sympathetic listeners, and among them he "shouldered his crutch, and showed how fields were won." He remained quite "unreconstructed" to the end of his life. In 1898, when Fitzhugh Lee and Joseph Wheeler were appointed brigadier generals in the United States Army, Lee is reported to have remarked: "I always wanted to outlive Joe, but now I want to die first, so as to be in hell and see the expression on Early's face when Wheeler arrives in a Yankee uniform."

General George Crook, who had fought against Early in the Valley campaign of 1864, passed through Lynchburg on January 4, 1890, and paid a visit to the seventy-three-year-old man. Crook's description, noted in his diary, indicates the extent to which the legendary figure of Early was being developed:

While waiting, we met Gen. Jubal Early, the ex-Confederate Gen. He is much stooped and enfeebled, but as bitter and virulent as an adder. He has no use for the government or for the northern people. Boasts of his being

¹ Jubal A. Early, *A Memoir of the Last Year of the War for Independence in the Confederate States of America* (Lynchburg, 1867). This, the second edition, was the first published in the United States. For a comment on this *Memoir*, see William D. Hoyt (ed.), "New Light on General Jubal A. Early after Appomattox," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), IX (1943), 114. A sketch of General Early is in Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone (eds.), *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), V, 598-99. See also the brief characterization of Early in Douglas Southall Freeman, *Lee's Lieutenants*, 3 vols. (New York, 1942-1944), III, 770.

unreconstructed, and that he won't accept a pardon for his rebellious offenses. He has survived his usefulness, and is living entirely in the past. He has fought his battles over so many times that he has worked himself into the belief that many of the exaggerated and some ridiculous stories he tells are true. We sat up with him until after 12 midnight, taking a hot scotch with him the last thing.²

In March, 1889, General Early had received another visitor from the United States Army, Lieutenant Lyman Walter Vere Kennon of the Sixth Infantry, who was attached to General Crook's staff in the Division of the Missouri as an aide. Lieutenant Kennon was making a study of the Shenandoah Valley campaign, and had been in Washington looking over the official records and interviewing officers who had participated. He wrote General Early a letter, requesting an interview, and received the following prompt reply:

Your letter was received this morning, and in reply I have to inform you that I will remain here until the 8th of March, on which day I will start for New Orleans. You can therefore find me here any day prior to that time, and I would be pleased to see you.

The Norvell-Arlington is the best place for you to stay at. Being a bachelor and not housekeeper I am unable to receive you as my guest.

If it should not be convenient for you to come here before the 8th of March, I will return here on the 15th, and remain for the balance of the month.³

Lieutenant Kennon arrived at Lynchburg on March 20, and visited with the General for three days. His impressions, as recorded in his diary, are presented here because of the information which they give concerning Early's environment and attitudes as an old man.⁴ The

² Diary of General George Crook (Army War College Library, Washington, D. C.). See sketch of General Crook in *Dictionary of American Biography*, IV, 563-64.

³ Early to Kennon, February 26, 1889, in Lyman W. V. Kennon Papers (Army War College Library). Lyman Walter Vere Kennon, born in 1858, was graduated from West Point in 1881. He was assigned to frontier duty, and joined General George Crook's staff as aide-de-camp in 1886, holding this position until Crook's death in 1890. During the war with Spain, Kennon served as a major of volunteers, and in 1899 was appointed colonel of the 34th Infantry, serving in the Philippine Islands. He completed the famous Benguet Road between Manila and Baguio. He was a rather prolific writer, author of military manuals, historical essays, and occasional papers. He died on September 9, 1918. United States Military Academy, Association of the Graduates, *Fiftieth Annual Report* (Saginaw, Mich., 1919), 85-96.

⁴ This diary is in the Kennon Papers (Army War College Library). Kennon's entries

result of Kennon's study was read before the Military Historical Society of Massachusetts on January 13, 1891, and later published in the *Papers of that Society*.⁵

March 20. Started for Lynchburg after getting rid of Craft. A gloomy ride. Dull, cold, gray day, and my feelings were like the day. Reached Lynchburg at about 5 p.m., and went to the Norvelle-Arlington. Had hardly reached my room when the obsequious darkey who had shown me up opened the door again, and grandeloquently announced, "General Early." I turned to the door, and there stood before me a man who seemed to be greatly aged, and who was bent with years. He asked, "Is this Lieutenant Kennon?"

"Yes, this is General Early, I presume?"

"Yes," and we shook hands.

The General walked in, and I set a chair for him, shut the window behind him, and, placing a chair in front of him looked the old Confederate General over. He was an old man, bent very considerably, but with a bright eye that had something of a twinkle in it, and seemed altogether very pleasant. He was somewhat bald, with white hair cut short, and a long, white beard. His head was not large, but was square rather than round. His nose was straight, and not quite so long as it appears in his photograph. His mouth I could not well see, as it was covered by his moustache. His eye seemed dark blue when I looked at him this evening, but is on daylight inspection brown, with a slight filing blue about the edge.

He had a habit of spitting thro' his teeth, in which he displayed a great degree of skill. His clothing was of gray cloth, like the cadet gray, but I thought not quite so blue. I spoke to him the next day about it, remarking that he still wore the gray. The old man smiled and said, "Oh yes, I never go back on my colors." At the same time he pulled up his coat sleeves and displayed his cuff buttons, which were a Confederate flag, gold with colors in enamel. His vest was of darker gray than coat and trousers. I remarked on the similarity between the cloth and the West Point uniform, and he said later it was bluer. I told him it was about the same, and he said in his day the cadet gray was the black mixture, not the blue.

His hat was of a peculiar pattern, a soft, broad-brimmed, white hat, with for the period of his visit with General Early were written after his return to Chicago. This accounts for some of the peculiarities in style and tense.

⁵ Lyman W. V. Kennon, "The Valley Campaign of 1864: A Military Study," in Military Historical Society of Massachusetts, *The Shenandoah Campaigns of 1862 and 1864 and the Appomattox Campaign, 1865* (Boston, 1907), 33-57. This is Volume VI of *Papers of the Military Historical Society of Massachusetts*, 14 vols. (Boston, 1895-1918).

the tallest crown I ever saw. It is the same kind of hat, I have been informed, that he wore during the war.

Such was General Early at the time I am writing of, so far as personal appearance was concerned. His personality in a broader sense I learned something of later.

He said he was a bachelor, and had written me to come to the hotel, as the accommodations were better. He himself was living in a room on the street nearby, and took his meals at another place. Otherwise he would have been glad to have me stop with him.

He asked where General Crook was stationed, and said he was glad to see him promoted to a Major-General, that he ought to have been before. "He ought to have been when that infer- who is that puritanical officer?"

"Howard," I suggested.

"Was he the man that had charge of the Freedmen's Bureau?"

"Yes."

"Well, he's the man.⁶ Crook ought to have been promoted then, I have always thought, for he was certainly the ablest of the men I had to deal with. It was he that came in and whipped me after I had beaten the other two corps at Winchester. With open country, and cavalry on both my flanks, and Crook, too, I couldn't hope to stay there. And at Fisher's Hill again, it was Crook who came in on my left and upset my dismounted cavalry, and they in turn upset the infantry. But I got even with him at Cedar Creek about a month later, when his troops were the first I broke up about five o'clock in the morning." And the old man's eyes twinkled at the recollection.

A little later we adjourned to the bar, the General remarking that if things were as they used to be I wouldn't have any objections to taking a little something, and to please him I didn't object. The General then left, and I went in to supper, and found my old Leland hotel waiter there.

After supper I sat in the office of the hotel, smoking a cigar, in a corner whence I commanded a view of all the entrances to the room, and awaited the coming of the General, as he said he would come again after supper.

In a short time the door opened, and the neat figure of the old Confederate appeared. As he wanted to see Maj. Daniels (?) the Virginia Senator,⁷ we waited in the office for a time, and then went up to my room and entered upon a conversation which lasted until quite late, and which was principally upon

⁶ Oliver O. Howard, who had been commissioner of the Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands from 1865 to 1874, was appointed major general on March 19, 1886. Crook was appointed to that rank on April 6, 1888.

⁷ John W. Daniel, native of Lynchburg and United States senator from Virginia, 1887-1910, was popularly known as the "Lame Lion." He was a remarkable speaker, and appealed strongly to the emotions of his constituents. He was also a strong anti-prohibitionist, a fact which must have endeared him to Early. *Dictionary of American Biography*, V, 67-68.

the subject of the Shenandoah Valley campaign in 1864. The General suggested that "we take something warm" before going to bed, and asserted that it was healthy. Trusting myself to his guidance, we betook ourselves to the back room of a saloon, where the General was evidently very much at home.

We were accorded the seats of honor next to a table in the corner of the room, and the old man ordered "something hot." We found there a young fellow of perhaps thirty five to forty years who was in the limp stage of intoxication. This young man had evidently heard the General fight over his old campaigns until he had them by heart, and who seconded the General's statements at all points, thus: General Early said he didn't have over 8,000 men in front of Washington. The Young Man said, "Don't believe you had that many." In his maudlin way he remarked, "Don't b'lieve you had 17,000 men." This remark referred to Opequan, but was irrelevant.

A Mr. Dent, a "cousin of Grant's wife," was also there. We staid until midnight, when I returned to the hotel and turned in. I had passed a very pleasant evening, and learned that the General's drink in the evening was hot scotch whisky with a little syrup and capsicum. He smokes three cigars a day, one after each meal, "Healthy, and keeps my bowels in order." Despises cigarettes, and expressed a belief that they impaired a man's virility; the paper was injurious, any paper was, fold a piece up in a cylinder and light it, and see what a strong, disagreeable odor was generated. But I shall reserve the remarks and opinions expressed by him until I have briefly accounted the day's doings, and lump them all into a paragraph by themselves.

March 21, 1889. The General turned up in the morning, and we talked war, etc., and then adjourned to his home. One block down from the hotel, and along the main business street for several blocks, and the General turned into a doorway and began to mount the stairs. The latter were old and dirty, the walls were dirty and old, reminding me of similar stairways I have seen in New York tenement houses. Blank, except for the dirt, dingy and old will describe the hallways. Up one flight we turned to the right, and stopped before a door which the General opened with a key. We entered.

The room was so dirty, so poor that at first I was ashamed to look around. It looked like an old, neglected storeroom. A small, round table stood in the middle of the room; on it was piled old papers and letters until it was as full as it was possible to be, a sort of cone of papers. In the corner to the right was another pile of books, papers, etc. Chests and books were piled against the wall on this side of the door, which led into a bedroom. This latter was dark, and I saw only the bed, which was made up, and looked clean, the only clean thing about the place.

On the side of the first room on which was the entrance door was a book case containing from 100 to 200 books, principally on law, altho' some were of a general character. Excepting the law books, the great majority were reports,

etc., on the war. On the left as we entered was a fireplace, with a coal fire burning. On its left more chests and books. On its right a sort of cupboard over which was a photograph of a horse, "Old Whitey," which had once been ridden by Early in the Shenandoah Valley campaign. On the mantel was a picture of Governor Letcher, very dusty. The walls of the room were otherwise bare and dirty, cobwebs and dust around the siding.

The floor in front of the fireplace was covered by two layers of matting and carpet, worn through, and evidently burned at some time by a coal falling on it from the fire.

The General produced two chairs of the cadet kind, and we sat down. He found an old volume of the *Historical Magazine*, and turned to Piatt's speech on Sheridan's ride, in which he states that Sheridan rode into fame on the back of Buchanan Reid, Pegasus, etc. This speech seemed to please Early a great deal, as he had frequently asked me if I had seen it. He also showed me Wright's report, published in '69 in the same magazine.⁸ I read these and some other things in this book.

I told General Early I would like to have his photo, and he fished around in some old chest and brought out a couple, telling me to take my choice. After awhile we went out and took a drink, meeting a Mr. Lyne (?).

After dinner—they have dinner at mid-day in Virginia—the General appeared at the hotel with a buggy and a very good horse. We drove out the road west as far as the ruins of the old Quaker church, General Early saying that there used to be a great many Quakers in this part of the country.

Hunter's headquarters were in a house near this church. On the right of the road leading out of the city, and perhaps a mile or more from it was a redoubt, still in good condition. On a ridge nearer the city was Early's headquarters. He showed me the place where he and Breckinridge⁹ stopped to get

⁸ Colonel Don Piatt, at a meeting of the 34th Ohio Infantry in 1869, responded to "The Day We Celebrate" by attacking "that piece of fiction" known as *Sheridan's Ride*, written by Thomas Buchanan Reade. He was quoted as saying: "On this occasion, he [Sheridan] galloped into glory on the back of Buchanan Reade's Pegasus, gingered by Murdoch, the tragedian." *Historical Magazine* (Boston, 1857-1875), Ser. II, Vol. VI (1869), pp. 362-63.

General Horatio G. Wright's report of the Sixth Corps in the battle of Cedar Creek appears in *ibid.*, 278-82. See also, *War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, 129 vols. and index (Washington, 1880-1901), Ser. I, Vol. XLIII, Part 1, pp. 158-61. Cited hereinafter as *Official Records*.

⁹ This was General John C. Breckinridge, former vice-president of the United States, who became a major general in the Confederate Army and later secretary of war in the Confederate cabinet. See sketch in *Dictionary of American Biography*, II, 7-10.

The comments on the position of troops refer to the operations around Lynchburg in May and June, 1864, in which the Confederates under Early and Breckinridge prevented a Federal force under General David Hunter from occupying the city. See Hunter's report of August 8, 1864, in *Official Records*, Ser. I, Vol. XXXVII, Part 1, pp. 96-103.

a drink of water at a well, and as they were drinking a shell from Hunter's batteries burst very near them.

The positions of the Federal and Confederate skirmishers were pointed out to me. The General showed me a position just at the edge of the city where Breckinridge had planned to place a battery. It would have been useless as a protection to the city, for the city lay right behind it, and could not fail to have been reached by Hunter's batteries. Early pushed out over a mile beyond. He had little artillery, and put some howitzers in the redoubt above mentioned, and kept banging away with them to scare Hunter.

He pointed out a low range of steep hills to the south, and said that if Hunter had been familiar with the country he could have got into Lynchburg by going along near their base.—(A flank movement to his left and rear might have done it. It looked rather doubtful to me though.)—Otter Peaks and Hunter's route were pointed out to me. The close proximity of the opposing skirmish lines struck me.

A grove of trees stood on the left of the road, wherein were some of Early's skirmishers. One of the trees, Early said, was struck by a Federal shell. I inferred that the marks were still visible, but my curiosity was not sufficient to cause me to brave the mud to look at it.

Returning, I took the lines for awhile, as the day was cold, and the General was without gloves. The road was vile, and the General held his whip so that it kept touching the horse's back, making him nervous and restless. The road being rough, it made the riding somewhat unpleasant, and as we went into a hole the General would ejaculate, "God A'mighty," which, by the way, was a favorite expression of his.

We went off by the orphan asylum, which, I was informed, was founded by a man of illegitimate birth for female orphan children. He was poor in youth, but died a millionaire.¹⁰

We then took the other road leading from the west into Lynchburg, and rode out some distance on it, but not far enough to see the other redoubts, covering this entrance into the city. There was a good position there that I tho't should have been its location, and I said so. General Early said he had nothing to do with placing them, they had been built before '64 by Breckinridge and others.

The mud was too deep for comfortable driving, and we turned back past the fair ground, entering the town by the same way we left it, and riding along the crest of the western ridge we went to the southern part of the city, Diamond

¹⁰ The orphan home was founded in 1868 and opened in 1875, the donor being Samuel Miller, of Lynchburg. Miller was born in Albemarle County, Virginia, in 1792 in poverty. Later his business capacity netted him a large fortune, much of which went to endow the orphanage. William A. Christian, *Lynchburg and Its People* (Lynchburg, 1900), 267-69.

Hill, and returning through this, the new part of the city, to the business position, passing the Lone Jack tobacco manufactory.

Lynchburg is the hilliest place I ever saw, and the hills are steep, too. Hand rails were placed along some of the sidewalks to assist foot passengers. The sidewalks were in some places stone stairways. The general air of the place was old, tho' a few new buildings could be seen occasionally. The Diamond Hill part was built up since the war.

We drove direct to the stable, and the General pointed out several houses on one street, saying, "Here is where the accommodating ladies of the town live. There's one of them now, sitting in the window," he added, pointing to a young and pretty girl sitting on the sill of a second story window.

Turning the horse over to the stable boy—it was a hired team—we walked up to the hotel and took "something warming," and met a Judge Spence,¹¹ who had been deposed in Reconstruction days. The judge was a portly man, with greasy-looking and shabby clothing. He said as we took our drinks that "Lynchburg people look upon General Early as the rest of the world did upon Jesus Christ. He was their Saviour." A few remarks were made somewhat derogatory to the character of the carpetbaggers, and we separated for supper, the General declining an invitation to take supper with me.

This evening was spent in the same place as the last. On reaching it we found Col. (?) Dent, Col. Marye, Maj. ———, who had served under Early during the war, Mr. Lyne, and a Mr. Yancey, who opened his mouth very wide when laughing, and he laughed often.¹² He was a young lawyer. Mr. Lyne had favored me with a call in my room after supper, and smoked a cigar and talked(?). He would think for awhile, and then with a deprecating gesture he would propound his proposition, usually a fool one. He was polite, and meant very well, but did not impress me as an intellectual giant. He offered to take me around to call on the Lynchburg ladies, but I was forced to decline.

Well, Mr. Lyne was there in this back room, and had "something hot," and more of it. Mr. L. finally declined to take any more when it got pretty late. The General said, "I admire your prudence." The General himself finally said

¹¹ David E. Spence was appointed judge in Lynchburg on August 7, 1865, and was removed by General John M. Schofield in 1869. He died on July 1, 1891. *Ibid.*, 241, 392.

¹² Lawrence S. Marye, an "ardent anti-prohibitionist" and editor of the Lynchburg *Virginian*, served as an ordnance officer in the Confederate Army. He was described by his commanding officer as "active, brave, and intelligent, with courage of the highest order." See report of General John S. Williams, September 18, 1862, in *Official Records*, Ser. I, Vol. XIX, Part 1, pp. 1081-85.

William T. Yancey was born in Bedford County, Virginia, in 1811, and was a lawyer in Lynchburg for fifty years. Christian, *Lynchburg and Its People*, 381. The Mr. Yancey mentioned here as "a young lawyer" was probably his son or grandson.

Mr. Lyne is not identified in Lynchburg histories. Possibly the name should be Lynch, a prominent name in that town and in Virginia.

he had enough. I suggested a nightcap, but he said he had had several already. But they were ordered, and came. He looked at me and asked if I was going to take another.

"God A'mighty," said he, and the evening was just begun. Lyne, the Major, and Mr. Yancey dropped out in the order stated. About one o'clock, the General went home, and Col. Marye and I kept on until two o'clock, when I started him on his way home, as well as the Major, who had revived a bit at the time.

The evening was one in which the "fun was fast and furious." Argument and contradiction were loud and simultaneous. I will start in with the beginning of the evening. I was presented to the Major as a member of General Crook's staff. He remarked that "he had often chased my chief in the Valley," to which I replied, "Yes, and were chased in turn." This was the only remark of this kind that I heard while in Lynchburg.

After a little conversation of a general character, somewhat enlivened by good-natured badinage between the General and Colonel Marye, the latter said he must tell me a story of General Early. He served voluntarily on the General's staff at the battle of Fredericksburg. He happened to be there on duty in the Ordnance Dept., and, having no special function to perform, tendered his services to General Early, who accepted them.

Here General Early interposed, and said Colonel Marye had served about fifteen minutes on his staff, and had been puffed up with pride ever since. An argument ensued, and then the Colonel resumed. Along about dusk the Federal batteries were playing upon one point, and General Early and his staff were at a gateway, exposed to the fire. The members of the staff were ducking their heads to dodge bullets, but the General sat unmoved, and firm as a statue.

The dodging of his staff irritated and annoyed him, and finally he turned to them and said, "Gentlemen, I want to see this dodging stopped. Sit up in your saddles. It isn't military to be ducking about in that way." Just then an 80 lb. shell came straight for the General, and would have hit him if he hadn't ducked so energetically that he went clear under the horse. Recovering his seat, he continued, "Unless it's one of those God-damned big fellows."

This created a general laugh. Early's eyes twinkled, as he put in, "Mr. Kennon, you mustn't believe a word that man tells you." "Oh, General!" the Colonel said.

His story had been told with frequent interruptions, etc., and much laughter on the part of all present, but he finally got thro' with it. This was the case with all the stories told. No statement was made that was not contradicted and argued, and great hilarity prevailed.

The General then said that Colonel Marye was but fifteen minutes with him, and then went off the field to his father's house in the rear of the field. Argument, which resulted in the establishment of the fact that Col. Marye went to his father's house to get a bottle of liquor which he sent to the General by Col.

Toliver (Taliaferro?).¹³ The General said it was a pretty slim bottle when it got to him, etc. Col. Marye stated that all the General's staff had taken refuge behind trees. The General did not, however, and he, being a volunteer, had stood out with the chief. But that he did awfully want to get behind one of the trees.

To prove the statement that Colonel Marye could not be believed, General Early stated that the judges at the fair last fall had awarded him the prize as being the biggest liar in the state of Virginia. Quel vacarme! Yancey, on being referred to, supported the General. It seems that Early was one of the judges, and had directed Yancey to present the prize referred to—"a gas bag," (toy balloon) to Colonel Marye, but it hadn't been presented, Mr. Yancey said, because it would create a scandal.

All laughed, and Col. Marye told the story of the Jackson monument, where Early was to make an address; nigger in parade, and refused, but Gov. Lee persuaded him to overlook them and speak. Hotel, and Englishman and Conn. Yankee in Early's bed, etc., and dispute, Early saying that there were two beds. It was referred to me whether or not it was reasonable to suppose that the two men would have gone to bed together if there had been two beds in the room. Gov. Lee stated that in morning found Early in two, with boots on, etc.

Then came the Henry Ward Beecher story; Early's tears and lamentations over Beecher's request for him to subscribe something to a monument, etc. The Major told, after Early left, of Early's coolness and deliberation under fire. Col. Marye said they talked and joked this way with the General, but they all had the most profound respect and admiration for him. His memory, Col. Marye stated, was remarkable. The Major said he had the most accurate and exact memory in the world. The Major said he climbed on his horse with most provoking deliberation at Sharpsburg, etc. A little after two I turned in.

March 22, 1889. Rose early, breakfasted, wrote home, and Col. Marye came in. I showed him the tables of losses, and some other papers we had spoken of during the previous evening, and talked awhile to little purpose. On his leaving I went downstairs, and found the Major, who related the wounded man incident, and said he was up too late and couldn't stand it. I met General Munford¹⁴ who served under Rosser, and who has had a disagreement with

¹³ William B. Taliaferro, Virginian, fought in the Mexican War as an officer in the 11th United States Infantry. He was active in state affairs, and took command of the militia at Harper's Ferry after the John Brown raid in 1859. During the Civil War he served under Stonewall Jackson until 1863. After the war he busied himself with the political and economic recovery of Virginia. *Dictionary of American Biography*, XVIII, 283-84.

¹⁴ Thomas T. Munford, Virginian, was graduated from Virginia Military Institute in 1852. He entered Confederate service as lieutenant colonel in the 30th Virginia Mounted Infantry, being mustered in by General Early. He served as a cavalry officer through the major campaigns of the war, particularly in Stuart's cavalry, under General Thomas L.

him. He is writing on the war. I was informed that he was a nice gentleman, but not remarkably brilliant intellectually. Gen. Munford talked awhile, and invited me to come to his house if I came to Lynchburg again.

Col. Marye I must describe. A long, iron-gray haired man, with trimmed beard and moustache, retreating forehead, rather narrow, and a large nose, with undecided kind of mouth. Gen. Munford was a small man, with dark, bright eyes, and white hair, nearly white moustache, otherwise clean shaven. Well-dressed, too, and the only one of the veterans that was.

Messrs. Lyne and Yancey were also clean-looking men. They both turned up later, and Mr. Lyne commented on the excellent physical trim army life gave to an officer. Both were suffering a little from the night before. It grew near 12 o'clock, and as I wanted to say goodbye to the General before I left at 12:45, I started down the street to go to his rooms, but met him on the way with a couple of books under his arm.

We returned to the hotel, and he sent his respects to Gen. Crook, adding that Crook and Averell¹⁵ were about the only officers who had served against them in that part of the country who bore the character of gentlemen, and they were so esteemed by the people of Virginia. He presented me with "Personal Reminiscences of Lee," and said, "I noticed your copy of my book was somewhat delapidated, and I have brought you another, which I trust you will accept." I took leave of him, expressing the gratification it had given me to meet him, and thanked him for his courtesy and that of his friends.

Then I mounted the stage and went down the steep hill to the station and started for Charlottesville. Thus ended my trip to Lynchburg.

In the course of the visit I asked many questions on various topics, and shall now try to give the General's answers, opinions, etc.

General Early spoke of the aqueduct affair in Washington, and thought Hoxie should have been left in charge of the work.¹⁶ He thought Hoxie was

Rosser. During the Valley campaign of 1864 he served under Early. Clement A. Evans (ed.), *Confederate Military History*, 12 vols. (Atlanta, 1899), III, 639-41; Virginia Military Institute, *Register of Former Cadets* (Roanoke, 1939), 17.

¹⁵ William W. Averell was a brigadier general of volunteers under Hunter and later under Sheridan. For Hunter's opinion of him, see Hunter to Grant, December 6, 1864, in *Official Records*, Ser. I, Vol. XXXVII, Part 2, pp. 366-67.

¹⁶ Richard L. Hoxie, graduate of West Point in 1868, was an engineer officer of considerable note. He was in charge of the Washington aqueduct from 1874 to 1884, and formulated the plans for the expansion of the water system so ably begun by General Montgomery C. Meigs. The crux of the expansion was a tunnel, supposed to carry the water under the ravine of Rock Creek. In January, 1884, before the proposed tunnel had been adequately surveyed and tested, Hoxie was relieved of his assignment by order of Major Garrett J. Lydecker, his superior officer.

Subsequent work on the tunnel proved extraordinarily expensive because of the rotten rock, and the lack of competence on the part of the contractors. Inspectors were bribed, and new appropriations obtained to carry on the work, but the scandal finally leaked

an able man and good fellow, a bright and intelligent man. But Bob Lincoln removed him from the charge of the aqueduct which he had planned and started. Hoxie married Vinnie Ream, whom Early knew. Early once told Mrs. Hoxie that the reason Lincoln had removed her husband was because she had made "so truth—— so ugly a likeness of Abraham Lincoln in the statue," not, as she asserted, because Capt. Hoxie had employed some ex-Confederates in subordinate positions in the aqueduct work.

Early told how he had first met Miss Ream. He was one of a committee to select from a number of models the best statue of Lee. He knew Vinnie Ream was to have one there, and thought to himself, "Now if I should go and select that Yankee woman's work I should never forgive myself." He did, however, select hers as the only one giving a correct likeness of Lee. He was consoled, however, when he discovered that she was a southern woman who had made, or helped to make the first Confederate uniform or flag or something.¹⁷

Early said that after Fisher's Hill he confronted Sheridan in the Valley and made him deploy his forces, and would then get his men back out of the way, and retarding the pursuit. He said that it was a solid line of infantry that confronted Averell, and not a mob at all; that Averell was wise not to attack. All Early's papers relating to the Shenandoah Valley campaign were captured from him in '65 in the affair at Waynesboro;¹⁸ he had none himself.

He told Crook, when the latter was brought to him at Staunton,¹⁹ that Sheridan ought to have been cashiered for the Winchester fight. Crook smiled,

out, and an investigation was held in 1888. Hoxie testified that he did not know why he was relieved from his job, but did know that he was "quite unprepared for the order." He had thought that the projected tunnel was unsound, and had told Lydecker so, but his advice had gone unheeded. See *Senate Reports*, 50 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 2686, for a full report of the investigation. Hoxie's testimony appears on pp. 447-73. Early's opinions on the case are good gossip, but apparently without much foundation.

¹⁷ Vinnie Ream, whom Early refers to as a southern woman, was born in Wisconsin in 1847 and came to Washington during the Civil War. She studied sculpturing in the studio of Clark Mills, and did a life-size statue of Lincoln, which was unveiled in 1871, and a larger bronze statue of Admiral David G. Farragut. See *Dictionary of American Biography*, IX, 317-18.

¹⁸ On March 2, 1865, Early was posted on a ridge west of Waynesboro. He was driven from this position by Sheridan's cavalry. Only Early and a few general officers escaped capture. Robert U. Johnson and Clarence C. Buel (eds.), *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, 4 vols. (New York, 1887-1888), IV, 521. For Early's account, see his *Memoir of the Last Year of the War*, 123-27.

¹⁹ Early on the morning of February 21, 1864, a company of Confederate rangers under Lieutenant Jesse McNeill bluffed their way into Cumberland, Maryland, and quietly captured General Crook and General Benjamin F. Kelley. See *Official Records*, Ser. I, Vol. XLVI, Part 1, pp. 468-72, and Part 2, pp. 620-27. On the way to Richmond with their prisoners, the rangers stopped at Staunton to display their prize to General Early. See also a manuscript account by Cyrus S. Roberts, entitled "Account of the Capture of Major General George Crook and Bvt. Major General Kelley" (Army War College Library).

and said nothing. He had nothing to do with Crook's capture. The first he knew about it was when the young officer sent by McNeill with the prisoners opened the door of his room at Staunton, and with a great flourish begged leave to present Maj. Gen. Crook and Maj. Gen. Kelley of the Federal Army. "I had to laugh. I asked Crook how many men he thought I had at Winchester." Crook said Sheridan thought about 30,000, but that he himself estimated Early's force at about 17,000. Early then said he knew more about the numbers engaged than any of them did, for he had very closely estimated Sheridan's forces, and knew his own.

The returns published in Pond's book²⁰ interested Early greatly, and he pointed them out to me. I asked him why he had so stretched out his command before the Winchester fight. He said he was obliged to play a bluff game, and deceive Sheridan as much as possible.

He wanted, too, to cut the B. & O., which he did. At Martinsburg he learned that Grant had been up there, and gave orders at once for his advanced divisions to move back.

At Cedar Creek he couldn't push his success along the Valley pike, because of the Federal cavalry. If Torbert had pushed Wickham²¹ from his position at Milford it would have been very serious for him, and it would have been very troublesome for him to have saved his army.

Tom's Brook: Rosser pushed in after Sheridan, saying he was going to drive him across the Potomac. Early sent him word to return. Rosser didn't, and got everlastingly thrashed.

Vaughn got a leave of absence before the battle of Winchester, and went to S. W. Virginia.²² He wrote his men, advising them to come to him there, and just before the fight of Sept. 19 Early found he had nothing of this brigade but the C. O. and his staff.

If Sheridan, after Fisher's Hill or Cedar Creek, had pushed for Charlottesville and Gordonsville, cutting the Central Railroad, Lee would have been forced to evacuate Richmond. Early said he could not have followed him.

It was really intended to release prisoners at Point Lookout, Early believed. He received his orders in regard to this move from Lee just as he was crossing the Potomac. He sent Bradley Johnson to release prisoners, and cooperate with the naval forces. It was principally a naval scheme.

I asked Early his opinion of Grant. He said he had already expressed it in his book. I asked him if he meant the "peg hammer" paragraph.²³ He said

²⁰ George E. Pond, *The Shenandoah Valley in 1864* (New York, 1883).

²¹ Brigadier General Alfred T. A. Torbert was commander of the First Division of the Cavalry Corps in Sheridan's army, and Brigadier General Williams C. Wickham commanded a cavalry unit in Early's force.

²² John C. Vaughn, a brigadier general of cavalry under Early.

²³ Early, *Memoir of the Last Year of the War*, 33-34. Early suggested that when

yes. He admitted that it was the only way in which the South could have been beaten.

He did not think Thomas a great man. Sedgewick was a good fellow, and a personal friend of Early. Early said he never met Sedgewick on the battlefield without beating him. McClellan was a great organizer, but over-cautious, and always estimated his opponent's force at four or fivefold his actual numbers. Early told Lincoln's story about McClellan,—“Good at dress parade, but no account for business,” and all the satellites laughed. He told the story of Mr. Lincoln and the lady who slipped down on the sidewalk, “Feathers on her head,” etc.

I asked him what he thought of Pope. He laughed and told the Lincoln story of Pope and his dispatches reminding him of a constipated woman, medicine, 50 operations, “49 was wind.”

On entering the back room for the first time, he introduced me, and said, “We must have no rebellious talk, for this gentleman belongs to the U. S. Army.”

Joe Hooker, “Fighting Joe,” and Early began the “Irrepressible Conflict” at West Point. Debating society and slavery discussion; Early objected to a statement Hooker had made, and Hooker said no gentleman would have made such a remark. Early said nothing, but when going out kicked Hooker. No fight, “and that's where he got the name of ‘Fighting Joe.’” Early said they used to cook things in rooms in his day.

He met Hunter in the Mexican war, and thought him a very decent sort of man, and liked him quite well. But in the war he proved to be very different. His course was marked with ruin and devastation. One woman had her supply of bacon taken, and Early said, “She was the maddest woman I ever saw.”

Early was with Taylor in the northern part of Mexico. He was once governor of a Mexican state. It was provided that when the “Alcalde” or civil governorship was vacant the government devolved upon the senior military commander, and some Mexican told him he was the best governor they ever had. Hunter was a paymaster then, and complimented Early on the order which prevailed in his command, saying that before he came everything had been in confusion.

Early served a year in the army in the Florida war, at the conclusion of which he resigned to practice law.

He seemed to think very lightly of Longstreet, and thought he was not as loyal to Lee as he should have been. He found fault with him, and with Rosser for writing and speaking as they did. Longstreet's contributions to war literature were full of envy. Long's book on Lee he didn't approve of.²⁴ Long was sick—blind—face all eaten away, and a man could not be sound in mind

Grant wrote a book on strategy he call it the “Lincoln-Grant or Pegging-Hammer Art of War.”

²⁴ Armistead L. Long, *Memoirs of Robert E. Lee* (New York, 1887).

under such circumstances. The book was a compilation, too, written by Venable and others, and was not altogether trustworthy.²⁵ Venable made a statement once in a letter which he denied having made until Early showed him the letter in his own handwriting, with the statement. Ergo: Venable's statements were not always accurate. He did not seem to think highly of Venable.

Early is loyal in an extreme degree to Lee. He said Lee used to ask opinions of his subordinates, tho' he always had his mind made up, and asked simply to ascertain the opinion and ability of the subordinates, and to raise their opinion of themselves.

Early said he was mighty glad when Sheridan relieved Averell from command. Averell was a very enterprising cavalry officer, and had given him a great deal of trouble. Averell and Crook were accounted gentlemen. Blair's house was not burned by his orders, but in spite of them.²⁶ He thought by neighbors who had robbed, and wished to save themselves. The flames broke out after he had gone away. He ordered contributions on enemy's town—the first during the war. The town of York was to raise \$100,000.00 but only raised \$28,000. "The town of York still owes me the difference, with interest to date."

"Sherman is an unprincipled fellow, but he had more capacity than Sheridan."—Col. Marye said he had been down to Appomattox court house and had witnessed a wedding in the very room where Lee had surrendered to Grant. This proceeding Early disapproved of, and prophesied misfortune. Col. Marye said it was very appropriate that the young man should surrender himself in such a place. Early objected, but said the man was "surrendering his liberty."

He is an incorrigible old bachelor himself, and still an unregenerate, unreconstructed, ribald old rebel, and incorrigible all around. Col. Marye (his father's place near Fredericksburg gives the name to Marye's Hill) told the Henry Ward Beecher story among much interruption and laughter and quibbling on points, questions of evidence, etc., raised and discussed in legal style.

Early said Grant offered his services to a Missouri Confederate Regt., but that its Colonel (Frost) knew him and his character in army days before the war, and declined to accept him. The correspondence, Early thought, was still in existence, though Grant had tried to get it.

He said it was stated that Sheridan was in Grant's company, and used to

²⁵ In the preface of his book Long expresses his indebtedness to Colonel Charles S. Venable, of General Lee's staff, and to others, "for indispensable aid in reviewing my manuscript, informing me of facts that had not come to my knowledge or reminding me of such as had escaped my recollection."

²⁶ This refers to the burning of the home of Postmaster General Montgomery Blair at Silver Spring, Maryland, on the night of July 12, 1864, as Early's force began to withdraw from Maryland after the battle of Monocacy. See Early, *Memoir of the Last Year of the War*, 62.

furnish him money to get liquor with, and that was why Grant was so lenient with him, and advanced him so.²⁷

Col. Marye told of Charles, Early's darkey, who had been with him for years, Early's tender care of him, and best of medical treatment. The General drunk, and "Are you my nigger or am I yours?" Usually got the liquor.

²⁷ The following statement has been inserted in the manuscript in red ink after the above paragraph: "Gen. Crook says this is not so. The Army Register for 1854 shows Grant a Capt. in the 4th Infantry, but Sheridan not in the Regt., but a Bvt. 2nd Lt. in the 1st Infantry. The Register for 1855 shows that Grant resigned July 31, 1854, and that Sheridan was appointed 2nd Lt. 4th Infantry Nov. 22, 1854."

Book Reviews

An Essay upon the Government of the English Plantations on the Continent of America (1701): An Anonymous Virginian's Proposals for Liberty under the British Crown, with Two Memoranda by William Byrd. Edited by Louis B. Wright. (San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1945. Pp. xxiv, 66. \$2.50.)

It is not often these days that in the well-tilled field of colonial history some piece of material as important as it is new can be discovered. Mr. Wright came across this anonymous essay on colonial government, "by an American," printed in London in 1701, found that almost no colonial historian knew of its existence or had made use of the half-dozen copies in American libraries, and reprinted it, to the service of colonial history.

The pamphlet originally appeared during the critical controversy over the abrogation of the rights of charter and proprietary colonies, and in general it supported the contention of the Board of Trade that no satisfactory solution of the colonial problem could be made unless all governments were reduced to a single pattern, that of the royal colony. With a preface that accuses Davenant, in his *Discourses on the Publick Revenues, and on the Trade of England* (1698), of getting his information on the colonies from William Penn, a highly prejudiced source, the author of this pamphlet comes out strongly for the abolition of proprietary government, the setting up of a permanent "convention" of all the colonies to handle intercolonial problems, and the creation of a new colonial post—a traveling commissioner who would report regularly to the Board of Trade on the state of affairs in every North American colony. Though his argument in general tends toward that end, he arranges it under a series of grievances and their remedies, in the course of which he supports: liberty of conscience in religion, and the imposing of severe penalties for blasphemy, cursing, and Sabbath-breaking; the clarification of the extent to which the laws of England applied to the colonies and of the legislative authority of colonial assemblies; a system of judicature in which the appeal to England should lie, not from the governor and council, but from judges appointed for good behavior and independent of governors; a uniform coinage; and the increase of colonial population through encouragement of aliens and of "small offenders" to settle in the colonies.

In his introduction, Mr. Wright tentatively assigns the authorship of the pamphlet—as did Lawrence Wroth in his *An American Bookshelf*—to Robert Beverley, who four years later wrote *The History and Present State of Virginia*,

though he thinks that both William Byrd II, appointed in 1701 as London agent for Virginia, and William Byrd the elder may have had something to do with it. His introduction summarizes the main arguments of the *Essay* and accepts them as a serious and informed contribution to the vexed problems of colonial government which confronted the Board of Trade.

These arguments can be regarded in another fashion, at which Mr. Wright hints without developing it, as indicative of the attitude of the ruling Virginia aristocracy toward other American colonies and toward the general problems of colonial government. None of the suggestions made by the anonymous author are original with him; all can be found in the pages of the *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial*. His development of them can be regarded as highly prejudiced in favor of his own class and colony, as provincial and even testy in presentation. He dislikes those Quakers in Pennsylvania who connive at piracy, lie in court, and are not so moral as they pretend, and he does not like to see good Church of England men in Virginia turn Quaker to escape militia duty. He thinks New York's contention that they protect all the colonies from the Indians and French absurd; they protect themselves and their own Indian trade, he says. He hates to see his servants and debtors escaping to proprietary colonies. He argues at length, not for repeal of the tobacco duty, but for some reapportionment of it that will not let the whole burden fall on the planter, and he laughs off Davenant's contention that large Virginia landowners make immigration to Virginia a hazardous business for small men. If the author is indeed Beverley, who died with one of the largest estates in Virginia and for years fought in Virginia and England a suit brought against him by one Selden, his essay can justify Colonel Quarry's comment of 1703 that Virginia aristocrats keep the "poorer sort" of people in their debt and, because they consider Virginia of more importance than any other colonies, hate to see greater privileges in government allowed New England and the proprietary colonies, and therefore become "very uneasy" and so soured in temper that a royal governor can scarcely both please them and follow instructions.

The Newberry Library

STANLEY PARGELLIS

Jonathan Dickinson's Journal or, God's Protecting Providence; Being the Narrative of a Journey from Port Royal in Jamaica to Philadelphia between August 23, 1696, and April 1, 1697. Edited by Evangeline Walker Andrews and Charles McLean Andrews. *Yale Historical Publications, Manuscripts and Edited Texts*, Volume XIX. (New Haven: The Yale University Press, 1945. Pp. x, 252. Illustrations, appendices, maps. \$3.00.)

The resumption of postwar travel along the Atlantic seaboard coincides with the appearance of this volume, which has to do primarily with the seventeenth century journey of Jonathan Dickinson, a Jamaican trader and merchant, from near the present site of Palm Beach to St. Augustine.

The long-neglected editing of the Dickinson document resulted from a journey made in the past decade by the editors, who discovered after motoring from New Haven to Florida that their winter home on Jupiter Island was located on the site of the most dramatic of the many dramatic scenes connected with the earlier journey. Dr. and Mrs. Andrews then set out to do for Dickinson's *Journal* what they had done with such consummate skill for the *Journal of a Lady of Quality* (1921).

Dickinson's recorded impressions constitute a vivid narrative of adventure and suffering, heroically endured. The narrator, accompanied by twenty-four other persons, sailed from Jamaica in late August, 1696. One month later their barkentine, *Reformation*, was wrecked on Jupiter Island and its entire cargo, consisting of sugar, molasses, rum, beef, pork, clothing, wine, ginger, and money, representing a total value of £1500, was destroyed. Menaced almost daily with death by their savage captors, the Dickinson party suffered four months of cruel experiences, including hunger, exposure, cold, and torment inflicted alike by insects and hostile Indians. Possibly their complete faith in "God's Protecting Providence" accounted for their final deliverance from these dangers and enabled them to make their way by foot and canoe through swamps and dangerous waterways to St. Augustine, where the Spaniards befriended them in their quest for the English colony of South Carolina.

The Andrews edition contains an introduction and 132 pages of appendices, maps, and illustrations, which set the reprinted *Journal* in its proper historical background and reconstruct the lives and personalities of the more important members of the party.

Abundant proof is provided in the exhaustive notes compiled by the editors that this chronicle "has become a valuable part of the colonial history of both England and America." Its chief significance lies in the fact that it is a veritable source book, and one of the earliest, for the customs and habits of southeastern Florida aborigines, as well as a testimonial of the good work achieved by the Spanish Franciscans in northeastern Florida. As a narrative of adventure and deprivation it has few equals. The extensive data assembled by the editors concerning the sixteen editions preceding their own make a noteworthy contribution to the history of printing in England as well as in colonial North America. Finally, as is conclusively shown by the large number of reprints and the widespread use made of the devout Dickinson's work by his fellow Quakers, it occupies, as Dr. Andrews points out, "a place of exceptional importance in Quaker annals, in that it became in the hands of the Society of Friends a testimony and a witness wherewith to impress upon an inhospitable world the working of God in the hearts of men and the power of the blessed truth professed by its members, inspiring them 'to bear with resignation even the worst of tribulations.' "

Principio to Wheeling, 1715-1945: A Pageant of Iron and Steel. By Earl Chapin May. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1945. Pp. xiv, 335. Illustrations, bibliography. \$3.00.)

This is a romantic, human-interest story of iron and steel written in the tempo, if not the style, of O. Henry and dedicated to the proposition that laissez faire is all-essential to economic progress. Threading a narrative on the continuity of successive generations of enterprising ironmasters, the book essays to trace the evolution of a colonial iron furnace established at Principio, Maryland, in 1715, into the modern steel city of Wheeling, West Virginia. According to the jacket blurb: "Two centuries of metallurgical pioneering and industrial expansion are delineated. A previously little known connection of President Washington's family with the Principio mining and smelting properties is interestingly documented. The story builds up to a climactic crescendo of present day activities of the Wheeling Steel Corporation. The narrative is enlivened by human-interest, trail-blazing episodes, told against a vivid background of America's unfolding economic power." The further claim is made by the publisher that "Both professional and amateur historians will be grateful to Mr. May for locating a valuable vein of historical ore by discovering and digging into heretofore unknown documents, some of which are here reproduced."

Principio to Wheeling is an entertaining story, but it will raise goose flesh on the most insensitive of orthodox historians. The following excerpts are typical of the impressionistic flavor of the work: "His gnarled, stubby, bruised fingers grew blacker with ink as he drove his quill pen sputtering across precious rag paper" (p. 19); "Sitting in front of Principio Company's countinghouse and store, General Manager John England contentedly puffed Maryland tobacco as he surveyed a familiar scene" (p. 23); and "Her blue eyes gleamed as she adjusted a little blue bonnet perched coyly on a blond, curly head, flung her red-lined cape over puffed sleeves and full skirt of blue woolen" (p. 28). Less innocent are some of the reconstructed conversations, the hypotheses, the nuances, and slips of the pen that vitiate so much of the solid material which the book contains. On page 201, for example, Mr. May writes that "Senator [*sic*] McKinley—elected by Republicans—had fathered a high tariff on tinplate," then goes on inferentially to associate "free enterprise" and McKinleyism as ideologically one and the same. Indeed, while the high tariff policy is given approval, the brief wartime strike of 1917 and the Great Steel Strike of 1919 are dismissed with a shrug—"inspired by the doctrine of William Z. Foster and the American Federation of Labor" (p. 252).

It would be superfluous to say that the book belongs on the shelf of popular literature. The author shows more concern for the elements of a good story and the processes of iron and steel than for the processes of history. It is true, he has worked a profitable vein of historical ore, and much of this he has appropriately embodied in the narrative with convincing effect; but nowhere does he

take the trouble to identify industrial records and personal correspondence which one can only guess were supplied by families of the chief characters and the steel companies. There are no footnotes, and the bibliography, containing pertinent printed material to be sure, lists none of the manuscript collections.

From the standpoint of those who take their history with a grain of salt, and especially those who uphold the primacy of ownership and management, the book leaves little to be desired. But it is not history of that conventional description which presumes critical analysis of the sources, unbiased interpretation, consistent respect for the dignity of known facts, and an effort to tell the whole truth.

West Virginia University

FESTUS P. SUMMERS

John Dooley, Confederate Soldier: His War Journal. Edited by Joseph T. Durkin. Foreword by Douglas Southall Freeman. (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1945. Pp. xxiii, 244. End maps, illustrations, appendices. \$3.00.)

With each addition to the list of Civil War journals and memoirs one wonders how long, O Lord, will they continue to flow from the press and find purchasers among the populace. But even while one ponders, they come and are bought.

Some are good, some are bad, and some are indifferent. John Dooley's piece about himself belongs in the good category for several reasons. First, Dooley had an eye for detail and was unusually articulate. Second, he served with a stellar outfit, the First Virginia Infantry, which was in the thick of fighting from the time Dooley joined it early in 1862 until his capture in the forefront of Pickett's Division at Gettysburg. Third, authentic narratives by members of this illustrious organization are conspicuously rare. Fourth, Dooley served both as a private and as an officer—he won his bars by election—and thus was able to view army life from two distinct angles. Fifth, the work is well edited by Father Durkin. And sixth, it has a sanctioning foreword by Douglas Southall Freeman.

For the most part, Dooley's record consists of day-by-day entries, but, like many veterans of the Confederate and other wars, he was constrained at later times to elaborate the diary. Fortunately for history, the additions were made soon after the events were first recorded, and in such a way as to be readily distinguishable from the original jottings. Father Durkin does not delete the elaborative comments, but sets them off by asterisks.

Dooley was the son of an Irish immigrant who, in a remarkably short time as a hatter and furrier, acquired wealth and social standing in Richmond. John, who was one of seven children, entered Georgetown College in 1856 at the age of fourteen. Early in 1862 he left school to join the Confederate Army. Capture at Gettysburg was followed by eighteen months' imprisonment in Balti-

more. He was exchanged in February, 1865. The closing months of the war were spent in recuperation and travel in the environs of Richmond, and it is in describing the period immediately following Lee's surrender that the young diarist makes perhaps his most notable contribution to Confederate history.

The Journal closes with the entry of May 6, 1865, but an epilogue traces Dooley's career briefly from September 5, 1865, when he entered the Novitiate of the Jesuit Order at Georgetown, until his death from an "indisposition of the lungs" on May 8, 1873.

Young Dooley recorded the usual things told by Confederate journalists—the awful fear with which one approaches the baptism of fire, the noise and confusion of conflict, the light and shadow of sin and righteousness in camp, the prankishness and boisterousness of the rank and file, the choking dust and the crushing exhaustion of the summer march, the archaic practices of Civil War physicians and surgeons, the unspeakable suffering of the wounded, and the torturing boredom of prison.

In one striking particular this account is different from most Civil War diaries; namely, the sparse reference to women. One suspects that Dooley was unusually timid, but this is mere conjecture.

Dooley's diary has not the raciness of Henry Kyd Douglas' *I Rode with Stonewall*, or the rakishness of John O. Casler's *Four Years in the Stonewall Brigade*. Nor is he anything like as gifted a raconteur as Samuel R. Watkins of "*Co. Aytch*." But the book is sound, interesting, and well worth the reading.

Washington, D. C.

BELL I. WILEY

Historical News and Notices

The termination of hostilities and the subsequent relaxation of the restrictions on the holding of conventions came too late to enable the program committee of the Southern Historical Association to resume its plans for the annual meeting which was originally scheduled to have been held in Birmingham in November. A meeting of the Executive Council will be held in Atlanta on November 10-11, and the election of officers for 1946 will be conducted by postal ballot.

The plans for a joint session with the American Historical Association at Washington in December have also been canceled because of the decision of that Association to hold only a meeting of its Council, a business meeting, and the annual dinner, with the presidential address.

It now seems reasonable to assume that the annual program meetings can be renewed next year with an enthusiasm and an attendance comparable to the pre-war meetings.

PERSONAL

Among the awards made under the new program of grants-in-aid for studies in the history of American civilization, sponsored by the Library of Congress with the assistance of the Rockefeller Foundation, the following are of special interest to Southerners or the southern region: a grant to Robert D. Meade, of Randolph-Macon Woman's College, for a biography of Patrick Henry; one to Oscar O. Winther, of Indiana University, for a study in American cultural history, based on Godey's *Lady's Book and Magazine*; one to William Charvat, of Ohio State University, for a study of the economics of authorship in America in the nineteenth century; and one to Chester McA. Destler, of Connecticut College, for a biography of Henry Demarest Lloyd.

Guggenheim fellowship awards in American history for 1945 include the following: Marie Kimball, of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation, for a life of Thomas Jefferson for the period of his governorship of Virginia and his ministry to France, 1776-1789; Merrill M. Jensen, of the University of Wisconsin, for the preparation of a history of the United States during the Confederation period, 1781-1789; Richard G. Lillard, of Indiana University, for a book on the part played in American history by the forest between the Atlantic Ocean and the Mississippi River; Clement Eaton, of Lafayette College, for a study of liberalism in the New South, 1865-1929; and Paul H. Giddens,

of Allegheny College, for a study of the growth of the petroleum industry in the United States, 1870-1895.

Lieutenant C. Vann Woodward, U.S.N.R., now on leave from his position as professor of history at Scripps College, Claremont, California, has been awarded a Rockefeller Foundation post-service fellowship for the completion of a book to be entitled "Origins of the New South, 1880-1913."

Under the system of rotating departmental chairmanships at the University of Oklahoma, Morris L. Wardell has been named chairman of the department of history for a two-year term. Carl C. Rister, who relinquishes the chairmanship, has been appointed research professor, and has received a grant from the American Philosophical Society for a study of the "Dust Bowl" region.

Carl Bridenbaugh, who was recently appointed director of the Institute of Early American History and Culture, at Williamsburg, Virginia, received his discharge from the Navy in September and assumed the duties of his new position on October 1.

William D. McCain, who has been on military leave of absence since March, 1943, has returned to his position and resumed his duties as director of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History and editor of the *Journal of Mississippi History*. Charlotte Capers, who acted as director during his absence, has resumed her position as assistant to the director.

Among those who have recently returned to academic positions following military or government service are: Charles E. Smith, of Louisiana State University; Alfred B. Thomas, of the University of Alabama; George V. Irons, of Howard College; and William C. Askew, of the University of Arkansas.

Summer school appointments for the past summer included the following: Robert S. Cotterill, of Florida State College for Women, and James H. Poteet, of Western Kentucky State Teachers College, at the University of Kentucky; Walter P. Webb, of the University of Texas, at the University of Michigan; Kenneth M. Stampp, of the University of Maryland, at the University of Wisconsin; Mary S. Carroll, of Mary Baldwin College, and Gladys Webber, of Colby Junior College, at Florida State College for Women; and Leon F. Sensabaugh, of Birmingham-Southern College, at the University of Alabama.

Because of continued ill health, Benjamin B. Kendrick has resigned from his position as professor of history and chairman of the department at the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina. Clarence D. Johns has been made acting chairman of the department, while Eugene E. Pfaff and Magnhilde Gullander have been promoted to the rank of professor, and Christiana McFadyen has been made assistant professor of history.

Henry Nash Smith, of the University of Texas, has been granted a leave of absence for the year 1945-1946, to serve as visiting professor of American history and literature at Harvard University. Leaves of absence have also been granted to Charles S. Sydnor and Dorothy M. Quynn, of Duke University, for research work, and to Stuart Noblin, of Davis and Elkins College, for the completion of graduate study at the University of North Carolina.

S. Walter Martin, associate professor of history at the University of Georgia, has been appointed assistant dean of administration in charge of the Co-ordinate College of the University.

New appointments which have recently been made are: Shelby T. McCloy, formerly of Duke University, to be professor of history at the University of Kentucky; Charles A. Barker, of Stanford University, to be professor of history at Johns Hopkins University; Dumas Malone, of the University of Virginia, to be professor of history at Columbia University; George R. Monks, a doctoral graduate of the University of Michigan, to be assistant professor, and Mary E. Mitchell, a graduate student at George Peabody College, to be instructor in history at Florida State College for Women; John S. Curtiss, a doctoral graduate of Columbia University, to be associate professor, and Frances D. Acomb, a doctoral graduate of the University of Chicago, and Madaline W. Nichols, of Goucher College, to be assistant professors of history at Duke University; Philip J. Green, of the University of North Dakota, to be professor of history and head of the department at Queens College; Austin L. Venable, of the University of Arkansas, to be professor of history and head of the department at Winthrop College; E. Bruce Thompson, of Mississippi College, to be associate professor of history at Baylor University; Paul Murray, of Georgia Southwestern College, to be professor of history at East Carolina Teachers College; Homer L. Knight, a doctoral graduate of the University of Missouri, to be associate professor of history at Northeast Missouri State Teachers College; Gilbert C. Fite, a doctoral graduate of the University of Missouri, to be assistant professor of history at the University of Oklahoma; James W. Moffitt, of Tennessee College, to be professor of history at Georgia Southwestern College; Wilfred B. Yearns, formerly of North Carolina State College, to be assistant professor of history at Wake Forest College; William A. Settle, a doctoral graduate of the University of Missouri, to be associate professor of history at the University of Tulsa; John C. Hamilton, formerly of the United States Military Academy, to be instructor in history at the University of Arkansas; Kenneth E. St. Clair, president of the Sayre School, to be visiting professor of history at Transylvania College; Adolph F. Meisen, a doctoral graduate of the University of North Carolina, and Walter J. Hansen, a doctoral graduate of the University of Michigan, to be supply assistant professors of history at the University of Mississippi; and Reuben J. Rath, formerly of the University of Arkansas and

now with the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Authority, to be assistant professor of history at the University of Georgia, with a leave of absence until September, 1946.

Announcements of promotions in the departments of history in southern colleges and universities have been made as follows: at the University of North Carolina, J. Carlyle Sitterson and James L. Godfrey to be associate professors; at the University of Florida, Rembert W. Patrick and Claude E. Hawley to be professors, and George Bentley to be associate professor; at the University of Texas, Coral H. Tullis, Barnes F. Lathrop, Truesdell S. Brown, and Ione P. Spears to be assistant professors; and at Texas State College for Women, A. Elizabeth Taylor to be assistant professor.

Lieutenant Ike Henry Moore, U.S.N.R., director of the San Jacinto Museum of History, was killed in action on an escort carrier in the Pacific area on May 4, 1945. Born in San Antonio in 1909, he was graduated with honors from the University of Texas in 1932, and received the M. A. degree in history in 1934. He served as instructor in history at the University of Texas in 1934-1935, and as state director of the Texas Historical Records Survey from 1935 to 1939. He became the first director of the San Jacinto Museum of History in 1939, and was granted a leave of absence from that position in 1943 for service in the Navy. An active member of the Southern Historical Association and of the Texas State Historical Association, he had made a special study of the history of early newspapers in Texas, and had published several articles dealing with phases of that subject.

Alex Mathews Arnett, professor of history at the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, died on August 7, at the age of fifty-seven. A native of Georgia, he was graduated from Mercer University and received the M. A. (1913) and Ph.D. (1922) degrees from Columbia University. He served as professor of history at Shorter College from 1912 to 1917; as instructor at Columbia University, 1917-1922; and one year as professor of history at Furman University, before going to the Woman's College as professor in 1923. Best known among his publications are: *The Populist Movement in Georgia* (1922); *The Story of North Carolina* (1933); *The South Looks at Its Past* (1935), done in collaboration with Benjamin B. Kendrick; and *Claude Kitchin and the Wilson War Policies* (1937). He was also a frequent contributor of articles and reviews in historical periodicals, and an active participant in programs of the annual meetings of the Southern Historical Association.

Victor Vard Aderholdt, professor of history at Lenoir-Rhyne College, Hickory, North Carolina, since 1922, died on August 27, at the age of fifty-four. He received the M. A. degree in history at the University of North Carolina in 1923, and pursued further graduate study at the University of Wisconsin in

1924 and 1928-1929. He had been a member of the Southern Historical Association since 1936, and was the author of a history of Lenoir-Rhyne College and of several articles dealing with the German element in North Carolina.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

The final enactment in July of the bill providing for the continuation to completion of the editing and publishing of the Territorial Papers of the United States marked the accomplishment of an objective which has long been the concern of the leading American historical societies and students of American history. Perhaps the most active proponent of the measure was the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, which has had a special committee at work on the project for the past three years; but its efforts were effectively supported by the American Historical Association, the Southern Historical Association, and many of the state and local historical societies.

Credit should also be given to Representatives Thomas E. Martin of Iowa and Pete Jarman of Alabama and Senators Carl Hayden of Arizona and Harold H. Burton of Ohio for the part which they played in promoting the passage of the bill. Their realization of the significance of these papers for an understanding of the growth and democratic process in America caused them to give generously of their time and support, and they are entitled to the gratitude of every serious student of American history for their contribution toward making the records more readily available for general use.

The forty-ninth annual meeting of the Texas State Historical Association took the form of a local meeting attended by members from Austin and its vicinity on April 27 and 28, 1945. The program included: a paper on "Lester Gladstone Bugbee," by Eugene C. Barker; one on "Amelia Barr," by Paul Adams; one on "The Early Trails of Northeast Texas," by Rex W. Strickland; one on "Baylor at Old Independence," by Jefferson D. Bragg; an address by Isaac J. Cox, entitled "Building up the Southern Border"; and the presidential address of Louis W. Kemp, on "The Beginning of Statehood." All officers of the Association were re-elected, and Merle M. McClellan of Baylor University was added to the membership of the executive council.

Recently elected officers of the Jacksonville (Florida) Historical Society are: Richard P. Daniel, president; William Mott, vice-president; Mary Graff, corresponding secretary; Dorothy Knoeppel, recording secretary; and James D. Holmes, treasurer.

The annual banquet meeting of the East Tennessee Historical Society was held in Knoxville on the evening of October 20, with Robert S. Henry of Washington, D. C., as the speaker. His subject was, "They Rode with Old Bedford," a study of the men who fought under General Forrest during the Civil War.

At the annual meeting of the Florida Historical Society, which was postponed from March to June, the following officers were elected for the year 1945-1946: president, Karl A. Bickel of Sarasota; vice-presidents, John B. Stetson, Jr., of DeLand, and Kathryn Abbey Hanna of Winter Park; recording secretary and treasurer, Albert C. Manucy of St. Augustine; corresponding secretary and librarian, Watt P. Marchman (on leave for military service); acting corresponding secretary and librarian, Mrs. M. A. Johnson of St. Augustine; members of the board of directors, Webster Merritt of Jacksonville, Henry I. Louttit of West Palm Beach, and K. A. MacGowan of Quincy.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

Among recent acquisitions of the Southern Historical Collection of the University of North Carolina are additions to the following collections: Kirby-Smith, J. C. C. Black, J. H. Summerell, Tucker, Heyward-Ferguson, Hobbs-Mendenhall, Joseph Milligan, James C. Harper, Henry A. London, Kimberly, and Thomas Burke. The Cameron Papers have been much more than doubled by a very extensive collection of letters, documents, and plantation records.

New collections include: two farm journals, 1834-1846, of Nicholas Massenburg of Franklin County, North Carolina; the family papers of Calvin Jones (1775-1846), physician and soldier, of North Carolina and Tennessee, including twenty-four manuscript volumes; the diary, 1852-1901, of Rev. S. A. Agnew (1833-1902), of Lee County, Mississippi; papers of John Perkins (1819-1885), planter, judge, and United States and Confederate representative in Congress from Louisiana; letters, 1858-1863, of John S. R. Miller, of North Carolina, U.S.A., in the West, and C.S.A., in Virginia; business and professional papers, 1770-1887, of the Nisbet family of Iredell County, North Carolina; the diary, 1831-1890 (34 volumes), of Jason Niles (1814-1894), member of Congress from Mississippi; diary of William Lawrence Mauldin (1845-1912), legislator and lieutenant-governor of South Carolina; letters of Edmund Pendleton to General William Woodford, 1776-1779; the diary, 1832-1883 (17 volumes), of John Berkeley Grimball of South Carolina; the diary, 1853-1910 (33 volumes), of Rev. George Gilman Smith (1836-1913), of Georgia; the Manigault-Morris-Grimball papers, including the diary, 1860-1861, of Meta Morris Grimball; papers of the Grimball family, of South Carolina, including thirteen volumes of plantation records and scrapbooks; the papers of John Macpherson Berrien (1781-1856), of Georgia, legislator, judge, United States senator, and attorney general in Jackson's cabinet; papers of the Baker family of North Carolina and Virginia; diaries, 1872-1888, and reminiscences of Colonel William Allan (1837-1889), of Virginia; war diary of James B. Jones, C.S.A., of Kentucky, North Carolina, and Missouri; papers of the Manumission Society of North Carolina; the papers of Duff Green (1791-1875), of Kentucky, Maryland, Georgia, and Washington, D. C., editor, publicist, and industrialist;

papers since 1920 of Samuel Chiles Mitchell (1864-), university professor, of Virginia; Confederate war diary and the autobiography of James W. Albright, journalist, of North Carolina; diary, 1863, of Lutie Kealhofer (afterwards Mrs. William Fell Giles, Jr.), of Hagerstown, Maryland; a small collection of papers of General and Rev. Francis Asbury Shoup (1835-1896), C.S.A., and of the Elliott family of South Carolina and Georgia; letters, 1857-1870, of Dr. Ethelred Philips, of Florida, to Dr. James J. Philips, of North Carolina; memoirs, 1860-1861, of Walter E. Philips of his early life in Edgecombe County, North Carolina, and as a student at the University of North Carolina; and the papers of Thomas M. Brower, member of Congress from North Carolina, including the proceedings of the Hamburg Lodge of the Union League, and a diary, 1876.

Photostatic, microfilm, and typed copies, as follows, were received: diary of Martha Schofield, teacher-missionary among the Negroes in South Carolina, 1865 and 1869; diary of Eugene Morehead (1845-1899), of Greensboro, North Carolina; the Allen-Simpson papers, consisting chiefly of Confederate war letters of J. M. Simpson of Alabama; St. John's Parish Register, 1842-1848, Maury County, Tennessee; farm record, 1833-1857, of John Thompson of Arkansas; "Mt. Airy" plantation records, 1805-1855 (3 volumes), Richmond County, Virginia; letters, 1840-1880, of Anna R. McIver of South Carolina; farm journal, 1855-1870, of D. G. Harris of South Carolina; the diary of Tench Tilghman (1810-1874), C.S.A., of Maryland; letters, 1819-1821, of Elisha Mitchell (1793-1857), scientist, of North Carolina, to Lewis David von Schweinitz (1780-1834), of Pennsylvania, scientist; the reminiscences of Rev. William Porcher DuBose (1836-1918), Confederate soldier and eminent theologian, of South Carolina and Tennessee; the war autobiography of Colonel David Wyatt Aiken (1828-1887), C.S.A., legislator, member of Congress, and agricultural leader, of South Carolina; and family notes, 1848-1854, of Christopher C. Scott, of Virginia.

Recent additions to the records in the National Archives include some of the older records that still remained outside the custody of the Archivist. Among them were Post Office Department registers and journals, 1828-1934; drawings and photographs of Federal buildings no longer in the possession of the Government, 1885-1945; records of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company and the Canal Towage Company for the fifty years prior to the purchase of the canal by the Government in 1938; records of the District Court for the Southern District of New York, 1789-1912; and a small group of Interior Department records, 1854-1879, relating to colonization of free Negroes and the suppression of the slave trade, which were received from the Library of Congress. As the result of a recent transfer from the State Department, the records of that Department in the custody of the Archivist are nearly complete through the year 1929. Among other material recently transferred to the National Archives are selective

service records of World War I, central files of the Adjutant General's office, 1917-1925, records of the Great Lakes Naval Training Center, 1911-1939, and Office of War Information records, 1931-1944.

The McGregor Library, University of Virginia, has recently acquired by gift, a collection of the personal and business papers of Wilson Cary Nicholas, about 3,000 items, with the bulk of the material falling between the years 1751 and 1820. That part of the papers, which Nicholas inherited from his father, Robert Carter Nicholas, includes material on the case of *Macon v. Ambler*, letters from John Norton and Sons, Samuel Athawes, and Edward Ambler. Wilson Cary Nicholas' own papers include materials on William and Mary College, his alma mater; the Albemarle County militia; various investments in western lands; interests in proposed schemes to increase the navigability of the James and Kanawha rivers; records of his term as collector of the Port of Norfolk, 1804-1806; accounts of his flour mill at Warren, in Albemarle County; archives from the Agricultural Society of Albemarle; subscriptions to Central College; and notes of the Bank of the United States in Richmond, of which he was president. Items of peculiar interest are the two notes of Nicholas, each for \$10,000 which were endorsed by his friend Thomas Jefferson. Nicholas was unable to meet these notes, and it fell to Jefferson to pay them, a circumstance that contributed much to the financial downfall of the Squire of Monticello. Correspondence from John Nicholas described politics in New York, and letters from James Morrison and George Nicholas reveal much of interest in Kentucky, with particular reference to the Alien and Sedition Laws. Also included in the papers are records of Nicholas' term as governor of Virginia during the war of 1812. Among the correspondents are: John Adams, Edward Ambler, John Ambler, Samuel Athawes, Richard Barbour, John Blair, James and William Breckinridge, Joseph Cabell, William H. Cabell, John Campbell, Dabney and Peter Carr, Wilson Miles Cary, William Duane, George William Fairfax, Joshua Fry, Francis Walker Gilmer, William B. Giles, William Waller Hening, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Kean, Henry Lee, James McDowell, John Marshall, William Marshall, James Maury, William Meriwether, Robert Morris, John Page, John Pendleton, Edmund Randolph, Thomas Jefferson Randolph, Thomas Mann Randolph, Samuel Smith, William Stith, John Taylor of Caroline, Henry St. George Tucker, and William Wirt.

Among the recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress the following, arranged in chronological order of materials, may be noted: four additional boxes of papers of the Biddle family of Philadelphia, 1655 to 1926; one reel of microfilm of papers, mainly letters to Isaac Briggs, 1691-1886; a manuscript volume of the "Standing Orders" of the House of Lords, British Parliament, [ca. 1748]; nine documents pertaining to British fortifications and finances, 1755, including one signed by George III; contem-

porary copy of orders of Major General William Shirley to Colonel Thomas Dunbar, August 12, 1755; letters to Governor Horatio Sharpe from Robert Dinwiddie, August 25, 1755, and from John Stanwix, April 10, 1760; George Washington's autograph copies of "Gen. Murray's Order of Battle 19th Aug.^t 1759," and of original plans used by Generals Amherst, Wolfe, and Murray in battle, against the French; one additional box of papers of the Shippen family of Philadelphia, 1760 to 1853; photostats of records from the Henry family Bible, Virginia, 1769 to 1911; letter of Thomas Pownall to Benjamin Franklin; twelve letters of Tobias Lear to Robert Brent and others, April, 1794, to December 14, 1815; letter of John Marshall to Hudson Martin, November 16, 1795; one box of papers of Benjamin Homans, 1796 to 1840; commission of William C. C. Claiborne as governor of Louisiana, signed by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, May 25, 1801; copy of letter of Albert Gallatin to William Few, May 9, 1813; a school notebook of Mary Ann Randolph Custis, 1823; three reels of microfilm of correspondence (1823-1825) of Heman Allen, United States minister to Chile (from Archivo Nacional, Chile); five letters (originals or reproductions) of James K. Polk to Alfred Flournoy, January 31, 1827, to September 14, 1835; two letters of R. Hinman to Peter Force, February 1 and 9, 1836; one box of papers of Theodore Parker, 1832 to 1863; ten letters or papers of James G. Clark, 1832 to 1866; one additional box of papers of Henry Ward Beecher, 1838 to 1878; eighteen additional boxes of papers of Robert G. Ingersoll, 1858 to 1934; letter of Fernando Wood, December 1, 1859; two volumes of records of Company F, 13th Regiment, Massachusetts Volunteers, United States Army, 1861 to 1864; letter of Charles F. Brunsen to Y. L. Klein, March 17, 1863; seven letters and documents of James S. Mitchell, 1864 to 1883; photograph of a letter of Robert E. Lee to D. McConaughy, August 5, 1869; one volume "Index to Narrative of L[ewis] T[appan]"; additional papers of Frederick Haynes Newell, 1885 to 1932; one volume diary of William Howard Taft, October 14 to November 9, 1907; one folder of papers of Alexander Meikeljohn, 1909 to 1923, including nine letters of Woodrow Wilson; letter of Woodrow Wilson to Job H. Lippincott, November 3, 1910; one box of papers of Royal Meeker, 1911 to 1922, including letters of Woodrow Wilson; and twelve additional packages of papers of the American Historical Association, 1929 to 1936.

Recent acquisitions by the Western Historical Manuscripts Collection of the University of Missouri include: the Cahoon papers, consisting of correspondence and case records of a Missouri lawyer of the post-Civil War period; the Peter Norbeck letters, covering the period from 1914 to 1936; the Wood-Holman papers, an extensive collection of a pioneer family covering the period from 1805 to 1906, and containing materials on gold rush, Civil War, agriculture, education, politics, and Indian affairs; the records of the O. P. Morton Post of the G.A.R., Joplin, Missouri; and the papers of Pearl D. Decker, a

Missouri lawyer and Congressman, including letters and scrapbooks for the period from 1897 to 1935.

A brief capitulation of the report on the Archives Collection of the Mirabeau B. Lamar Library of the University of Texas shows that for the two-year period ending on August 31, 1945, the acquisitions amounted to approximately 64,000 manuscripts, 269 maps, and 91 reels of microfilm copies of manuscripts. These additions bring the total holdings of the Collection to 2,737,364 manuscripts, 3,801 maps, and 694 reels of microfilms.

Among the more important recent acquisitions are two extensive collections dealing with Mexican history. One of these, the Sánchez-Navarro collection, consists of documents relating to the personal affairs of a family which formerly owned about one-half of the present state of Coahuila. These documents, dating from about the middle of the seventeenth century to 1826, throw much light on the socio-economic conditions of that area. The other, the Hernández y Dávalos collection, consists of documents which Juan E. Hernández y Dávalos did not include in the six volumes of documents covering the period of Mexican history from 1808 to 1821, published by him between 1877 and 1882. The documents in this collection, covering the period from 1760 to 1824, supplement and in a large measure complement the six volumes of published documents.

Other important additions include: the papers of Anson Jones, the last president of the Republic of Texas; the George Travis Wright family papers, containing much early Red River history as well as county record books of Miller County which was claimed by both Texas and Arkansas; the collection of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph E. Taulman relative to the Parker and Taulman families in Texas and their migration to the state from Virginia and New York; a collection of letters written by Chaplain R. F. Bunting of Terry's Texas Rangers during the Civil War; microfilm of the Albert S. Burleson papers, covering his career as a member of Congress and as postmaster general in the Wilson cabinet (originals in Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress); and the personal and official files of Henry W. Harper, who was dean of the Graduate School of the University of Texas from 1900 to 1936.

Plans have been made for locating, collecting, editing, and publishing during the next three years a comprehensive documentary history of education in the South during the colonial and ante-bellum periods, under the direction of Edgar W. Knight, Kenan Professor of Education in the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, who will be assisted by several research workers and consultants. Financial support of the study has been provided by one of the philanthropic foundations and by private funds, and the study will include the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

Education in the southern states has rarely been properly presented in historical accounts, chiefly because the sources of educational history in the South have not been available for students and writers on the subject. These states are rich in documentary materials which illustrate the beginnings and growth of public educational theories and practices, especially during the colonial and ante-bellum periods. But these materials are scattered and some of them are constantly being lost or becoming inaccessible in other ways. The opportunity of students and teachers of the social and educational history of the southern states will be greatly increased by the collection and publication of these important materials.

Professor Knight will welcome any leads to documents that may throw light on the development of education in the South prior to 1860.

In commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Florida to statehood, *Florida Highways*, published monthly at Winter Garden as the authorized medium of the Motor Vehicle Division and other state departments, devoted its June, 1945, issue to historical sketches. Among the articles are: "Florida, 1845 to 1945," by William T. Cash; "Florida Enters the Union," by Rembert W. Patrick; and "Florida's Capitol," by John Kilgore. Well-chosen contemporary views of early town and plantation scenes enhance the value and usefulness of this issue.

The Fall, 1944, issue (Vol. VI, No. 3) of the *Alabama Historical Quarterly*, published in September, 1945, is devoted exclusively to the publication of "Alabama Census Returns, 1820, and an Abstract of Federal Census of Alabama, 1830." The records presented for 1820 are copied from the manuscript schedules, containing the names of the heads of families and the number of persons in each family, including slaves, for the following eight counties: Baldwin, Conecuh, Dallas, Franklin, Limestone, St. Clair, Shelby, and Wilcox. The schedules for the remaining twenty-one counties of that time have not been found.

Southern State and Local Finance Trends and the War (Nashville, Vanderbilt University Press, and Lexington, University of Kentucky Press, 1945, pp. 106, tables, appendix, 50 cents), by James W. Martin, prepared under the co-operative sponsorship of the Kentucky Bureau of Business Research and the Vanderbilt Institute of Research and Training in the Social Sciences, deals with the trends in southern state and local government finance since the early 1920's and seeks to discover how the second World War has affected those tendencies. The first four chapters discuss the changes in taxation, expenditures, debts, and intergovernmental fiscal relationships, and the final chapter is an analysis of "General Fiscal Administration in the South." Twelve tables present the most essential of the statistical data which form the basis of the study, and an appendix of six pages offers a critical discussion of the reliability

of these data. The volume should be especially helpful to discerning citizens who are not political scientists or economists.

Sam Slick in Texas (San Antonio, The Naylor Company, 1945, pp. xxviii, 78, illustrations, bibliographical notes, \$2.00), by W. Stanley Hoole, with a Foreword by J. Frank Dobie, is the product of an interesting bit of detective work stimulated by Mr. Hoole's curiosity concerning the identity of an early Texas humorist whose *Piney Woods Tavern, or Sam Slick in Texas* and *A Stray Yankee in Texas*, published in New York in the 1850's under the pseudonym of "Philip Paxton," reflected so accurately the folklore of the Southwest. Starting from the known fact that the author's real name was Samuel Adams Hammett, he has succeeded in piecing together from fragmentary and widely scattered sources a connected account of Hammett's career from his early youth to his death in 1865 at the age of forty-nine. In doing this he has related Hammett's activities as a student at New York University, 1832-1834; his business ventures in New York City and in Texas; his travels; and his later literary success; and has established the important fact that much of his writing was autobiographical. That Mr. Hoole had a good time tracing down his man is obvious in the enthusiasm with which he has told the story, and yet, to quote from Mr. Dobie's Foreword, "he has . . . made his own trail so plain that people following it will know when he is stepping exactly in the tracks of Samuel Adams Hammett and when he is coursing by instinct. He has proven himself an honest as well as a canny detective."

Recommended Readings for the Florida Centennial (Winter Park, The Union Catalog of Floridiana, 1945, pp. 63, \$1.00 in cloth binding; 50 cents in paper cover), by Alfred J. Hanna, is described by its compiler as an "exploratory publication," designed to suggest the best that has been written on Florida and "to create keener appreciation of the century of statehood and to stimulate broader interest in Florida's background of more than four centuries." Selected and arranged primarily for the student and general reader rather than for the research scholar, the list begins with a group of eight books which are designated as "indispensable," and includes a brief note on each, explaining why it is so classified. It would be difficult to quarrel with the selections which have been made, from the point of view either of inclusions or of omissions.

The major portion of the space (pp. 15-53) is devoted to a list of "recommended readings," consisting of approximately one hundred and fifty titles under some fifteen categories ranging from biography and description to fiction and children's books. Here, as should be expected, there is a wide range in the quality of the works listed; but the notes on individual titles are more descriptive than critical, and in too many cases they have been entirely omitted. Brief space is also given to maps and charts, newspapers, and periodicals, but the discussion is too general to provide an adequate impression of the richness of such material, even for the non-professional reader.

Considering its primary purpose, the project is well-conceived; and as an "exploratory publication" it has laid the basis for an extremely valuable contribution toward a better understanding of the state by its inhabitants, whether they be natives or newcomers. It deserves to be developed on a more lasting foundation than a passing interest in a centennial celebration.

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

- "German Prisoners in the American Revolution," by Lucy Leigh Bowie, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (September).
- "William Pinkney's Public Career, 1788-1796," by Max P. Allen, *ibid.*
- "The Loyalist Plot in Frederick," by Dorothy Mackay Quynn, *ibid.*
- "Politics in Maryland during the Civil War," continued, by Charles Branch Clark, *ibid.*
- "Exemption from Military Service in the Old Dominion during the War of the Revolution," by Arthur J. Alexander, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (July).
- "The 'Affair near James Island' (or, 'The Battle of Green Spring'), July 6, 1781," by Charles E. Hatch, Jr., *ibid.*
- "A Survey of Stafford County Records," by George H. S. King, *ibid.*
- "Jefferson on the Press," by Glenn Curtis Smith, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (July).
- "Notes on the Early History of Mount Vernon," by Charles C. Wall, in the *William and Mary Quarterly* (April).
- "The Import Trade of Colonial Virginia," by Calvin B. Coulter, Jr., *ibid.* (July).
- "John Stuart Accuses William Bull," by John Richard Alden, *ibid.*
- "Ranger Mosby in Albemarle," by Virgil Carrington Jones, in the *Papers of the Albemarle County Historical Society* (1945).
- "Reconstruction in West Virginia," by Milton Gerofsky, in *West Virginia History* (July).
- "Some West Virginia Scientists," by Carrol H. Quenzel, *ibid.*
- "Alderson-Broadbent College," by Charles H. Ambler, *ibid.*
- "Trinity College, 1839-1892: The Beginnings of Duke University," by Nora Campbell Chaffin, in the *Southern Association Quarterly* (August).
- "Andrew Jackson, Post Obitum," by Culver H. Smith, in the *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* (September).
- "William H. Polk's Mission to Naples, 1845-1847," by Howard R. Marraro, *ibid.*
- "Charles Wilkins Short, 1794-1863, Botanist and Physician," by P. Albert Davies, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (July).
- "The Slavery Controversy between Robert Wickliffe and Robert J. Breckinridge Prior to the Civil War," by Hambleton Tapp, *ibid.*

- "Historical Sketch of the Geological Map of Kentucky," by Willard Rouse Jillson, *ibid.*
- "The Capitols of Kentucky," by Bayless E. Hardin, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (July).
- "Early Kentucky History in Madison County Circuit Court Records," continued, by Jonathan T. Dorris, *ibid.*
- "John Rowan's Mission to the Two Sicilies (1848-1850)," by Howard R. Marraro, *ibid.*
- "Slavery and Party Realignment in Missouri in the State Election of 1856," by Walter H. Ryle, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (April).
- "Reform in the Roaring Forties and Fifties," by Marie George Windell, *ibid.*
- "The Troubles of the Circuit Rider," by James A. Hazlett, *ibid.* (July).
- "The Fayette of the Eighties," by Lilburn A. Kingsbury, *ibid.*
- "The Public Land Policy of the Five Civilized Tribes," by Norman Arthur Graebner, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (Summer).
- "The Brave Major Moniac and the Creek Volunteers," by Carolyn Thomas Foreman, *ibid.*
- "The Round-Up of 1883: A Recollection," by Ralph H. Records, *ibid.*
- "The Freedom of the Church College in Oklahoma," by Charles Evans, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

- "Contemporary Report of the Battle of Baltimore," in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (September).
- "James Madison's Autobiography," edited by Douglass Adair, in the *William and Mary Quarterly* (April).
- "A Frenchman Visits Norfolk, Fredericksburg, and Orange County, 1816," continued, edited by L. G. Moffatt and J. M. Carrière, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (July).
- "Copies of Extant Wills from Counties Whose Records Have Been Destroyed," continued, edited by George H. S. King, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (July).
- "The English Family of Nelson in Hanover County," by Virginia Armistead Nelson, *ibid.*
- "The Albemarle County Court Order Book, 1744/45-1745/46," edited by Mary Rawlings, in the *Papers of the Albemarle County Historical Society* (1945).
- "Personal Property Tax List of Albemarle County, 1782," edited by Lester J. Cappon, *ibid.*
- "West Virginians in the American Revolution," continued, edited by Ross B. Johnston, in *West Virginia History* (July).
- "Some Tennessee Letters, 1849 to 1864," edited by Joseph H. Parks, in the *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* (September).

- "Stephen Washington Holladay's Civil War Letters," edited by George C. Osborn, *ibid.*
- "Record of Commissions of Officers in the Tennessee Militia, 1809, 1810," continued, compiled by Mrs. John Trotwood Moore, *ibid.*
- "The Missouri Reader: Explorers in the Valley," edited by Kate L. Gregg, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (April).
- "Isaac McCoy's Second Exploring Trip in 1828," edited by John Francis McDermott, in the *Kansas Historical Quarterly* (August).

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "French Origins of Carolina," by St. Julien Ravenel Childs, in the *Transactions of the Huguenot Society of South Carolina* (1945).
- "Samuel Lander, Educational Pioneer," by Mrs. John O. Willson, in the *Southern Association Quarterly* (August).
- "John Witherspoon Ervin," by Anne King Gregorie, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (July).
- "The St. Thomas Hunting Club, 1785-1801," by James H. Easterby, *ibid.*
- "The Mestizos of South Carolina," by Brewton Berry, in the *American Journal of Sociology* (July).
- "Hannibal I. Kimball," by Willard Range, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (June).
- "The Peeles—Troup County Pioneers," by Hugh Buckner Johnston, *ibid.*
- "Early Settlers in British West Florida," by Clinton N. Howard, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (July).
- "Pioneer Florida: Jackson's Premature Proclamation, 1821," by T. Frederick Davis, *ibid.*
- "The Last Spanish Census of Pensacola, 1820," by Duvon C. Corbitt, *ibid.*
- "Florida in 1845: Statistics, Economic Life, Social Life," by Dorothy Dodd, *ibid.*
- "Notes on Seminole Negroes in the Bahamas," by Kenneth W. Porter, *ibid.*
- "Basil Manly, Frederick A. P. Barnard, and the University of Alabama Curriculum Inquiry, 1852-1854," by Elbert V. Wills, in the *Southern Association Quarterly* (August).
- "Reforms in the Penal System of Mississippi, 1820-1850," by E. Bruce Thompson, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (April).
- "Prelude to a Career: L. Q. C. Lamar Tries Politics," by Willie D. Halsell, *ibid.*
- "Anti-Racial Agitation in Politics: James Kimble Vardaman in the Mississippi Gubernatorial Campaign of 1903," by Eugene E. White, *ibid.*
- "The Political Career of Isaac Johnson, Governor of Louisiana, 1846-1850," by Sidney Joseph Aucoin, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (July).
- "The American Siddons," by John Smith Kendall, *ibid.*

- "Don Pedro Favrot, a Creole Pepys," by Helen Parkhurst, *ibid.*
- "Indian Guests at the Spanish Arkansas Post," by Stanley Faye, in the *Arkansas Historical Quarterly* (Summer).
- "Arkansas Defends the Mississippi," by Fred H. Harrington, *ibid.*
- "The Brooks-Baxter Contest," by James H. Atkinson, *ibid.*
- "Lester Gladstone Bugbee, Teacher and Historian," by Eugene C. Barker, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (July).
- "Forerunners of Baylor," by Dan Ferguson, *ibid.*
- "Baylor University, 1851-1861," by Jefferson Davis Bragg, *ibid.*
- "The House of Barr and Davenport," by J. Villasana Haggard, *ibid.*
- "Early Nebraska Markets for Texas Cattle," continued, by Norbert R. Mahnken, in *Nebraska History* (September).

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "A Provisional Guide to Manuscripts in the South Carolina Historical Society," continued, by Helen G. McCormack, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (July).
- "Memoirs of Frederick Adolphus Porcher," continued, edited by Samuel Gailard Stoney, *ibid.*
- "Marriage and Death Notices from the City Gazette of Charleston, S. C.," continued, contributed by Elizabeth H. Jervey, *ibid.*
- "Journal of General Peter Horry," continued, *ibid.*
- "Letters of a Confederate Surgeon: Dr. Abner Embry McGarity, 1862-1865," edited by Edmund Cody Burnett, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (June).
- "Diary of Thomas Rodney, 1804," edited by Laura D. S. Harrell, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (April).
- "Southern Louisiana and Southern Alabama in 1819: The Journal of James Leander Cathcart," edited by Walter Prichard, Fred B. Kniffen, and Clair A. Brown, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (July).
- "Check List of Texas Imprints, 1846-1876," continued, edited by Ernest W. Winkler, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (July).
- "Dr. John Sibley and the Louisiana-Texas Frontier, 1803-1814," continued, edited by Julia Kathryn Garrett, *ibid.*

GENERAL AND REGIONAL ARTICLES, DOCUMENTS, AND COMPILATIONS

- "Sex Composition and Correlated Culture Patterns of Colonial America," by Herbert Moller, in the *William and Mary Quarterly* (April).
- "For the Study of American Colonial History: The Newberry Library," by Ruth Lapham Butler, *ibid.* (July).
- "The United States Military Philosophical Society, 1802-1813," by Sidney Forman, *ibid.*

- "Fourth of July Myths," by Charles Warren, *ibid.*
- "Jefferson's Retirement as Secretary of State," by Philip M. Marsh, in the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (July).
- "The Legal Status of Jamaican Slaves before the Anti-Slavery Movement," by Robert Worthington Smith, in the *Journal of Negro History* (July).
- "Anthony Adverse or Theodore Canot?" by John A. Kinneman, *ibid.*
- "Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society," by Elaine Brooks, *ibid.*
- "Slavery as a Diplomatic Factor in Anglo-American Relations during the Civil War," by Sadie Daniel St. Clair, *ibid.*
- "Civil and Military Relationships under Lincoln," by James G. Randall, in the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (July).
- "A Lost Incident in Lincoln's Life," by David Rankin Barbee, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (July).
- "Herndon's Contribution to Lincoln Mythology," by Louis A. Warren, in the *Indiana Magazine of History* (September).
- "The Southern Claims Commission: A Postwar Agency in Operation," by Frank Wysor Klingberg, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (September).
- "The Baltimore Convention of 1912," by Arthur S. Link, in the *American Historical Review* (July).
- "A Letter from One of Wilson's Managers [Thomas W. Gregory]," edited by Arthur S. Link, *ibid.*
- "Immigrant Settlements in Southern Agriculture: A Commentary on the Significance of Cultural Islands in Agricultural History," by Walter M. Kollmorgen, in *Agricultural History* (April).
- "Turner's Theory of Social Evolution," by Rudolph Freund, *ibid.*
- "Culture on the American Frontier," by Edward Everett Dale, in *Nebraska History* (September).
- "The Railroad Land Grant Legend in American History Texts," by Robert S. Henry, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (September).
- "History, the Key to the Magic Door," by George Fort Milton, in the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (July).

CONTRIBUTORS

CHARLES S. SYDNOR is professor of history at Duke University.

HAROLD W. BRADLEY is professor of history and dean of the Graduate College, Claremont Colleges, Claremont, California.

JAMES W. SILVER, associate professor of history at the University of Mississippi, is now on leave for overseas service with the American Red Cross.

HOMER CLEVINGER is professor of history at Lindenwood College, St. Charles, Missouri.

MISS WILLIE D. HALSELL is a teacher in the public schools at Itta Bena, Mississippi.

W. STANLEY HOOLE is director of libraries at the University of Alabama.

MARTIN F. SCHMITT is chief of the military reference section in the Army War College Library, Washington, D. C.

THE HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

*A quarterly circulated widely in Latin America and the
United States containing articles, inedited documents,
book reviews, minor notices, and professional news.*

MANAGING EDITOR: JAMES FERGUSON KING

BOARD OF EDITORS

Arthur S. Aiton
Carlos E. Castañeda
Charles C. Griffin
Lewis Hanke
Roscoe R. Hill

Roland D. Hussey
James F. King
Irving A. Leonard
Arthur P. Whitaker

ADVISORY EDITORS

Herbert E. Bolton
Isaac J. Cox
Clarence H. Haring

Dana G. Munro
J. Fred Rippy
William S. Robertson

Editorial correspondence: PROFESSOR JAMES F. KING
ROOM 439, BANCROFT LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY 4, CALIFORNIA

Business correspondence: DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS
COLLEGE STATION
DURHAM, N. C.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$4.00 A YEAR
SPECIAL RATES TO GRADUATE STUDENTS

VIRGINIA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Organized 1831 — Chartered 1834

ALEXANDER W. WEDDELL, PRESIDENT

Publishers of the

VIRGINIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

The July, 1945, issue contains the following:

*Exemption from Military Service in the Old Dominion during the
War of the Revolution*, by Arthur J. Alexander.

The "Affair near James Island," by Charles E. Hatch, Jr.

*A Frenchman Visits Norfolk, Fredericksburg, and Orange County,
1816*, by J. G. Moffatt and J. M. Carriere.

A Survey of Stafford County Records, by George H. S. King.

Book Reviews

Genealogies

Notes

MEMBERSHIPS: Life, \$100.00; Annual Sustaining, \$50.00;
Annual Supporting, \$25.00; Annual, \$5.00
Magazine sent without additional charge to members

The Lee House, 707 East Franklin St.
RICHMOND 19, VIRGINIA

Editor and Corresponding Sec'y.
CLAYTON TORRENCE

The Pacific Historical Review

Issued by the
Pacific Coast Branch
of the

American Historical Association

Articles, documents, book reviews, comments
and historical news on the entire Pacific area

BOARD OF EDITORS

Managing Editor: LOUIS KNOTT KOONTZ

Book Review Editor: JOHN W. CAUGHEY

DAN E. CLARK

FRANCIS H. HERRICK

PETER M. DUNNE, S.J.

MERRILL M. JENSEN

WILLIAM H. ELLISON

W. KAYE LAMB

MAX SAVELLE

Published in March, June, September, and December

Subscription rates: \$4.00 a year;

Canada, \$4.25; other countries, \$4.50

SPECIAL RATES TO STUDENTS

A sample copy will be sent on request

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

The William and Mary Quarterly

A Magazine of Early American History, Institutions, and Culture

A new series of the William and Mary College Quarterly
with a broadened field of interest

Published by the College of William and Mary

Board of Editors

THOMAS P. ABERNETHY
University of Virginia

RANDOLPH G. ADAMS
Clements Library

JULIAN P. BOYD
Princeton University

VIRGINIUS DABNEY
Richmond Times-Dispatch

DOUGLAS SOUTHALL FREEMAN
Richmond News Leader

LEONARD W. LABAREE
Yale University

SAMUEL ELIOT MORISON
Harvard University

RICHARD L. MORTON
College of William and Mary

CURTIS P. NETTELS
Cornell University

STANLEY PARGELLIS
Newberry Library

JOHN E. POMFRET
College of William and Mary

ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER
Harvard University

EARL G. SWEM
College of William and Mary

THOMAS J. WERTENBAKER
Princeton University

LOUIS B. WRIGHT, Huntington Library

Managing Editor RICHARD L. MORTON, College of William and Mary

Subscription rates: \$4.00 the calendar year. \$1.00 a copy

Correspondence relating to the

William and Mary Quarterly should be addressed to the Managing Editor,
College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia

AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

Designed as a medium for the publication of research and documents pertaining to the history of agriculture in all its phases and as a clearing house for information of interest and value to workers in the field. Materials on the history of agriculture in all countries are included and also material on institutions, organizations, and sciences which have been factors in agricultural development.

ISSUED QUARTERLY SINCE 1927

BY

THE AGRICULTURAL HISTORY SOCIETY

Subscriptions, including membership: Regular, \$3.00; Student, \$1.50;
Contributing, \$10.00; Life, a sum in dollars equal to 100 less
age of applicant.

Editor:
EVERETT E. EDWARDS

Secretary-Treasurer:
ARTHUR G. PETERSON

ROOM 3901, SOUTH BUILDING, 13TH AND C STREETS SW
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Complete back files of **THE JOURNAL OF SOUTHERN HISTORY**

Including title page and index for each volume
may be obtained at \$3.00 per volume

Single numbers can be supplied at 75 cents each

SEND ORDERS TO

JAMES W. PATTON, *Secretary-Treasurer*

NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA



THE TEXAS STATE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

1897—*The Oldest Learned Society in Texas*—1897

Offers in **THE SOUTHWESTERN HISTORICAL QUARTERLY**

Articles, documents, comments, news notes, and book reviews
dealing with Texas and the Southwest

Managing Editor

WALTER PRESCOTT WEBB

Associate Editors

CHARLES W. HACKETT

RUDOLPH L. BIESELE

H. BAILEY CARROLL

Subscription rate: \$3.00 per year

Correspondence relating to contributions and subscriptions should be
addressed to the Managing Editor, University Station, Austin, Texas.

The Association also publishes

THE JUNIOR HISTORIAN

A literary and historical magazine by and for young people of
Junior High, Senior High, and Lower College levels. The first
magazine in America for young people also written almost
exclusively by them.

Editor

H. BAILEY CARROLL

Subscription rate: \$1.00 per school year.

Correspondence relating to *The Junior Historian* should be
addressed to the Editor, University Station, Austin, Texas.

THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

●

PRESIDENT

FLETCHER M. GREEN, University of North Carolina

VICE-PRESIDENT

ELLA LONN, Goucher College

SECRETARY-TREASURER

JAMES W. PATTON, North Carolina State College

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(In addition to the officers named above)

EX-PRESIDENTS

(For three years following expiration of their terms)

ALBERT B. MOORE, University of Alabama (1945)

J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON, University of North Carolina (1946)

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, University of Kentucky (1947)

MANAGING EDITOR

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY, Vanderbilt University

ELECTED MEMBERS

WILLIAM G. BEAN, Washington and Lee University (1945)

JENNINGS B. SANDERS, Memphis State College (1945)

LYNN M. CASE, Louisiana State University (1946)

RALPH B. FLANDERS, New York University (1946)

J. WINSTON COLEMAN, JR., Lexington, Kentucky (1947)

HENRY T. SHANKS, Birmingham-Southern College (1947)

INDEX

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME XI

- Abel, Annie Heloise, 424.
Abolitionists, and efforts to "redeem" Upper South, 181-84, 198-99, 212-13.
Acomb, Frances D., 572.
Adair, Douglass G., 286.
Adams, Ephraim D., 424.
Adams, Henry, 459.
Adams, Herbert B., influence on southern historical scholarship, 4-8, 18, 22.
Adams, Horace, 440.
Adams, John, political thinking of, 469, 486.
Adams, John Quincy, 52.
Aderholdt, Victor V., deceased, 573-74.
"Advent of William Gregg and the Graniteville Company," ed. by Thomas P. Martin, 389-423.
Advertiser (Boston), comments on Lincoln's policy, 305-306.
Agriculture, Washington's attitude toward, 481; development of on southern frontier, 149-76.
Aiken, George L., on Charleston stage, 541.
Alabama, frontier conditions in, 158-59; migration to, 171-74; supports Underwood candidacy, 235-36, 243-45.
Alabama, C.S.S., Wilkes' efforts to capture, 329, 333-37, 344, 347.
Alabama Historical Quarterly, publishes early census returns, 580.
Alabama Polytechnic Institute, historical activities at, 15-16.
Album of American History: Colonial Period, noted, 137.
Alexander, Laura, on Charleston stage, 546.
Allain, T. T., in Louisiana unification movement, 365.
Allen, Henry W., interest in Confederate colonization, 36-39; publishes *Mexican Times*, 40, 44-45; dies in Mexico, 50.
Allen, Max P., 286.
American Historical Association, announces Beveridge Memorial Prize, 129; annual meeting cancelled, 570.
American Historical Societies, 1790-1860, by Leslie W. Dunlap, noted, 137-38.
Anderson, Godfrey T., 286.
Anderson, Robert, at Fort Sumter, 312, 313-14, 539.
Anderson, William M., interest in Confederate colonization, 41.
Andrews, Charles M., (coed.), *Jonathan Dickinson's Journal or, God's Protecting Providence*, revd., 565-66.
Andrews, Evangeline W., (coed.), *Jonathan Dickinson's Journal or, God's Protecting Providence*, revd., 565-66.
Andros, Edmund, colonial governor, 69, 74.
"Annual Report of the Secretary-Treasurer," by James W. Patton, 89-92.
"Ante-Bellum Attempts of Northern Business Interests to 'Redeem' the Upper South," by George Winston Smith, 177-213.
Antislavery movement and northern business interests, 180-83.
Antoine, Caesar C., in Louisiana unification movement, 358.
Appleton, Nathan, New England manufacturer, 180.
Aptheker, Herbert, 286.
Architecture, development of on southern plantations, 370-88.
Argus (Norfolk), and northern colonization scheme, 204, 206.
Arnett, Alex M., 460; revs. Simkins' *Pitchfork Ben Tillman: South Carolinian*, 123-25; deceased, 573.
Articles of Confederation, Washington's opinion of, 473.
Ashe County, N. C., livestock raising in, 162.
Askew, William C., 571.
Atherton, Lewis E., 127.
Averell, William W., Early's comments on, 558, 559, 562.
Bailey, Kenneth P., *Thomas Cresap: Maryland Frontiersman*, revd., 264-65.
Ballagh, James C., offers first course in southern history, 7; deceased, 127-28.
Baltimore, Democratic convention in, 242-45.
Baltimore and Ohio railroad, Civil War business of, 52.
Bancroft, Frederic, deceased, 280.

- Bankhead, John H., leader of Underwood campaign, 234-36; in Baltimore convention, 243-45.
- Bankhead, William B., nominates Underwood, 243.
- Banks, Nathaniel P., commands Federal force on Rio Grande, 227-28.
- Banshee*, profits as blockade runner, 218.
- Barbados, accused of aiding Confederacy, 336.
- Bardolph, Richard, 278.
- Baringer, William E., *A House Dividing: Lincoln as President Elect*, revd., 431-33.
- Barker, Charles A., 572.
- Barksdale, Ethelbert, in Mississippi politics, 521, 529.
- Barnhart, John D., 126.
- Barracouta*, British warship, encounter with Wilkes, 342.
- Bassett, John S., influence in southern historical research, 8-12.
- Bates, Edward, quoted, 299.
- Bauer, Richard H., 439.
- Bauerlein, George, Jr., 127.
- Bauskett, John, letter to, 402-403.
- Bazaine, François, French commander in Mexico, 38; interest in Confederate colonists, 40, 49.
- Beale, Howard K., 279.
- Beard, Charles A., 424.
- Beatty, Richmond C., (ed.), *Journal of a Southern Student, 1846-48*, by Giles J. Patterson, revd., 273-74.
- Beauregard, Pierre G. T., Confederate commander at Charleston, 539; interest in Louisiana unification movement, 356-57, 362.
- Becker, Carl L., 424.
- Bee, Hamilton P., in Carlota colony, 45.
- Bellamy, Edward, 510, 517.
- Belle Boyd, Confederate Spy*, by Louis A. Sigaud, noted, 287-88.
- Benjamin, Judah, P., 215.
- Benn, Walter, on Charleston stage, 544.
- Bennett, Augustus G., receives surrender of Charleston, 541.
- Bennett, James Gordon, 194.
- Bentley, George, 573.
- Benton, Thomas H., 190.
- Bermuda, as blockade-running base, 219; Wilkes' attempt to blockade, 340.
- Bethel Church, migrates from South Carolina, 172.
- Beverley, Robert, criticism of Nicholson, 76, 78-79.
- Binkley, William C., 89, 90.
- Birney, James G., 6.
- Birney, William, 6.
- Blackmar, Frank W., 424.
- Blair, James, British agent in Virginia, 69; activities of, 70, 74.
- Blanton, Wyndham B., *The Making of a Downtown Church*, noted, 447.
- Blatchford, Richard M., and northern business interests, 195.
- Bliss, Philemon, defense of Underwood, 193.
- Blockade-running, during Civil War, 214-29; Wilkes' efforts to stop, 329, 335-46.
- Blount County, Ala., factors in settlement of, 172-73.
- Bluntschli, Johann C., 5, 6.
- Board of Trade, Byrd's protests to, 73, 75, 76-78.
- Bohn, Auguste, in Louisiana unification movement, 357.
- Bolton, Herbert E., 31.
- Bonham, Milledge L., 19.
- Bonner, James C., 126, 286; synopsis of paper by, 84-85; "Plantation Architecture of the Lower South on the Eve of the Civil War," 370-88; revs. Flanders' *Early Georgia Magazines*, 112-14.
- Booth, Edwin, on Charleston stage, 539, 540.
- "Bourbon Period in Mississippi Politics, 1875-1890," by Willie D. Halsell 519-37.
- Bourne, Henry E., 424.
- Bowen, Francis, comment on Mormon migration, 190.
- Bowles, Samuel, supports northern colonization, 198; comment on Lincoln's policy, 311.
- Bowles, William A., early career, 246-49; relations with English and Spanish, 250-54; establishes state of Muskogee, 254-59; letter of marque by, 260-61.
- Bowman, Isaiah, comment on migration factors, 166.
- Boyce, Ker, interest in Graniteville Company, 394, 411-12, 415; letters from, 403-404.
- Boyd, Belle, biog., noted, 287-88.
- Boyd, Mark F., 130.
- Boyd, Minnie Clare, 126.
- Boyd, William K., contributions to southern history, 9, 17-18.
- Bradley, Harold W., "The Political Thinking of George Washington," 469-86.
- Brady, Thomas A., 127.
- Branch, John P., promotes historical work, 26.
- Brazos Santiago, Federal force at, 227-28.
- Breckinridge, John C., defense of Lynchburg, 553-54.
- Brengle, Lawrence J., president of Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company, 63.
- Bridenbaugh, Carl, 440, 571.
- Brisbane, Abbott H., interest in southern manufacturing, 395-96, 406-408; letter from, 408-409; Hammond's comments on, 410-16.
- Brisbane, Albert, 395.
- "British View of the Siege of Charleston, 1776," ed. by Frances Reece Kepner, 93-103.

- Brown, A. J., on migration to Mississippi, 170.
- Brown, Albert G., withdraws from politics, 519, 521.
- Brown, John Henry, interest in Confederate colonization, 41.
- Brown, Marshall W., 278.
- Brown, Truesdell S., 573.
- Brown, William G., early historian of the South, 457.
- Browning, Orville H., advises Lincoln, 305; Lincoln's comment to, 320.
- Brownsville, Tex., Federal force at, 227-28.
- Bruce, Philip A., work in southern history, 15, 32.
- Bruner, Clarence V., 126.
- Bryan, John Stewart, deceased, 128.
- Bryan, William J., conflict with Underwood, 232-34.
- Bryant, William Cullen, describes southern workers, 183; supports northern business interests, 194.
- Buchanan, James, sends reinforcements to Pensacola, 313.
- Buck, Paul H., 89.
- Buckner, Simon B., in Confederate colonization plans, 35-36.
- Buley, R. Carlyle, (coauth.), *The Midwest Pioneer; His Ills, Cures, and Doctors*, revd., 265-67.
- Buncombe County, N. C., on route to livestock market, 161-62.
- Burch, J. Henri, in Louisiana unification movement, 365, 368.
- Burke, Emily P., comments on southern architecture, 371-72.
- Burkitt, Frank, farm leader in Mississippi, 531.
- Burton, William E., on Charleston stage, 539.
- Business interests, in South Carolina during 1830's, 390-423; efforts to "redeem" Upper South, 177-213; and Louisiana unification movement, 350-52, 356-58.
- Butler, Benjamin F., 501.
- Buttrick, Tilly, statement on stock raising, 152.
- Byrd, William, Virginia planter, 68, 74-75.
- Byrd, William, II, opposition to Governor Nicholson, 68-79; memorials by, 73, 75, 76-78.
- Calhoun, John C., Trent's lecture on, 14; Dodd's interest in, 28; biog., revd., 108-12.
- Callcott, Wilfrid H., (ed.), *South Carolina: Economic and Social*, revd., 436-37.
- Campbell, John, British commander in Florida, 248.
- Cannon, Joseph G., revolt against, 231.
- Capers, Charlotte, 441, 571.
- Cappon, Lester J., 282, 441.
- Carey, Henry C., influence on northern business interests, 177-83.
- Carey, Mathew, economic theorist, 177, 179-80.
- "Carlota, A Confederate Colony in Mexico," by Carl C. Rister, 33-50.
- Carmichael, Oliver C., 86.
- Carondelet, Baron de, relations with Bowles, 253.
- Carroll, Mary S., 571.
- Carson, George B., 440.
- Casa Calvo, Marqués de, efforts to capture Bowles, 256.
- Cash, Wilbur J., on factors in southern history, 464.
- Castañeda, Carlos E., 279.
- Catholics, attitude toward Louisiana unification movement, 363.
- Cauthen, Charles E., 126.
- Ceredo, northern colony in Virginia, 209-10.
- Chadwick, John, owner of Charleston Opera House, 545-46.
- Chalmers, James, British officer in Revolution, 247.
- Chalmers, James R., elected to Congress, 533.
- Chappell, Gordon T., 439.
- Charles Schreiner, *General Merchandise: The Story of a Country Store*, by J. Evetts Haley, revd., 275-76.
- Charleston, siege of by British, 93-103; Gregg's business interests in, 391; Confederate resistance at, 319; surrender to Federals, 540-41; theatrical interest during Civil War, 538-47.
- Charleston Library Society, activities of, 445.
- "Charleston Theatricals during the Tragic Decade, 1860-1869," by W. Stanley Hoole, 538-47.
- Charvat, William, 570.
- Chase, Salmon P., 396; decision in *Peterhoff* case, 223-24.
- Cherokee County, Ala., group migration to, 171-72.
- Cherokee Indians, relations with Bowles, 251.
- Cherry, F. L., description of frontier conditions, 158-59.
- Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, Civil War problems of, 51-67.
- Cheves, Langdon, 407, 408.
- Chicago, University of, study of southern history at, 27-28.
- Child, Lydia M., and northern colonization scheme, 212.
- Chitwood, Oliver P., (coauth.), *A Short History of the American People*, noted, 446.
- Church College of the Old South, by Albee Godbold, revd., 271-73.
- Civil War, Lincoln and the beginning of, 297-323; effect on Chesapeake and Ohio

- canal, 51-67; attitude of European powers toward, 214-15; blockade-running activities in, 218-29; activities of Wilkes in, 324-48; Confederate propaganda in, 487-503; Charleston theatricals during, 538-47.
- "Civil War Career of Charles Wilkes," by William W. Jeffries, 324-48.
- Claiborne, John F. H., account of frontier conditions, 156-57.
- Clare, S. T., on Charleston stage, 541.
- Clark, Champ, candidate for presidential nomination, 242-45.
- Clark, Edward, in Confederate colonization plans, 36, 38.
- Clark, John B., 16.
- Clark, John B., in Confederate colonization plans, 36.
- Clark, Thomas D., 89, 129, 439; synopsis of paper by, 84-85.
- Clarke, George W., interest in Confederate colonization, 41.
- Clay, Henry, Dodd's interest in, 29.
- Cleveland, Grover, 523.
- Clevenger, Homer, "The Teaching Techniques of the Farmers' Alliance: An Experiment in Adult Education," 504-18.
- Climate, as a factor in migration, 166-68.
- Clinton, Sir Henry, in siege of Charleston, 93-103.
- Clyde, Paul H., 279, 439.
- Cobb, Howell, 493.
- Coleman, J. Winston, Jr., 90, 278.
- Colonial Agents of the Southern Colonies*, by Ella Lonn, revd., 426-27.
- Columbia University, interest in southern history at, 18-23.
- Commager, Henry S., 464.
- Commerce, Washington's attitude toward, 481.
- Commerce-raiders, Wilkes' efforts to capture, 333-37.
- Completion of Independence, 1790-1830*, by John A. Krout and Dixon Ryan Fox, revd., 262-63.
- Confederacy, effect on Chesapeake and Ohio canal, 54-63; incidents of blockade, 214-29; propaganda in, 487-503.
- Confederate blockade, incidents of, 214-29.
- Confederate colony in Mexico, 33-50.
- Confederate Receipt Book*, as propaganda medium, 496.
- Confederate States Almanac*, as propaganda medium, 496.
- Conrow, William, in Confederate colony, 38.
- Coosa River Valley from De Soto to Hydroelectric Power*, by Hughes Reynolds, revd., 434.
- Corbitt, Duvon C., (coed.), "A Letter of Marque Issued by William Augustus Bowles," 246-61.
- Corning, Erastus, and northern business interests, 196, 206.
- Cortina, Juan N., causes trouble on Rio Grande, 227-28.
- Cotterill, Robert S., 85, 571; on central theme of southern history, 463; revs. Martin's *Florida during the Territorial Days*, 267-68.
- Cotton mills, development of in South Carolina, 389-423.
- Coulter, E. Merton, 439.
- County Government in Georgia*, by Melvin C. Hughes, noted, 446-47.
- Cox, Isaac J., 424.
- Craven, Avery O., on factors in southern history, 467.
- Cravens, John N., 127.
- Creek Indians, Bowles' relations with, 246-47, 248-51, 254-55.
- Crenshaw, Ollinger, 126; synopsis of paper by, 86-87.
- Cresap, Thomas, biog., revd., 264-65.
- Crisp County, Ga., grazing economy in, 160.
- Crittenden, Christopher, 136.
- Crook, George, visits General Early, 548-49; Early's comments on, 551, 558, 559-60, 562.
- Cropesa, Z. P., interest in Confederate colonization, 41.
- Cruickshank, Earl F., 127.
- Cumberland Plateau, stock raising on, 161-62.
- Cuming, Fortescue, statement on stock raising, 152.
- Curry, Calvin H., 126.
- Curtin, Andrew G., receives advice from Lincoln, 304, 320.
- Curtiss, John S., 572.
- Dahlgren, John B. A., demolishes Fort Sumter, 540.
- Daniel, John M., comment on Confederate morale, 503.
- Daniel, John W., friend of General Early, 551.
- Daniels, Josephus, *The Wilson Era: Years of Peace, 1910-1917*, revd., 276-77.
- Darby, William, statements on stock raising, 152, 153, 167, 168.
- Darden, Putnam, farm leader in Mississippi, 531.
- Davenport, Fanny, on Charleston stage, 539, 547.
- Davenport, F. Garvin, 439; revs. Pickard and Buley's *The Midwest Pioneer: His Ills, Cures, and Doctors*, 265-67.
- Davidson, Philip, revs. Lonn's *Colonial Agents of the Southern Colonies*, 426-27; (coed.), *Development of Library Resources and Graduate Work in the Cooperative University Centers of the South*, noted, 136.

- Davidson, Victor, on migration to Georgia, 171.
- Davis, Charles S., 16.
- Davis, David, association with Lincoln, 297.
- Davis, Edwin A., revs. Kane's *Deep Delta Country*, 274-75.
- Davis, Jefferson, 35, 519, 520; comment on blockade-running, 218; efforts to improve Confederate morale, 489-90; Trent's lecture on, 14; Petrie's interest in, 16; Dodd's interest in, 28.
- Davis, Reuben, withdraws from politics, 520.
- Davis, William W., 16, 19.
- Day, James I., in Louisiana unification movement, 357.
- Dean, Julia, on Charleston stage, 539.
- Deep Delta Country*, by Harnett T. Kane, revd., 274-75.
- Democratic party, and unification in Louisiana, 349-69; activities in Mississippi, 519-37; presidential candidates in 1912, pp. 234-45.
- Denmark, complaints concerning Wilkes' activities, 334, 337, 343, 344-46.
- Desmond, Laura, on Charleston stage, 541.
- Destler, Chester McA., 570; revs. Ekirch's *The Idea of Progress in America, 1815-1860*, 269-71.
- Development of Library Resources and Graduate Work in the Cooperative University Centers of the South*, ed. by Philip Davidson and A. F. Kuhlman, noted, 136.
- Dever, J. W., interest in blockade-running, 220.
- Devereaux, John A., draws plans for Charleston Opera House, 545.
- Dial* (The), historical contributions in, 424-25.
- Dickinson, Jonathan, journal of, revd., 565-66.
- Disraeli, Benjamin, comment on American power, 216.
- Doctoral Dissertations Accepted by American Universities, 1943-1944*, ed. by Edward A. Henry, noted, 286.
- Dodd, William E., 424; contributions to southern history, 23, 26-30, 457.
- Dolphin*, British ship, seizure of, 337; significance of case, 338, 345, 347.
- Donnelly, Ignatius, leader in Farmers' Alliance, 505, 510.
- Dooley, John, Confederate journal of, revd., 568-69.
- Dorchester, Lord, sends Bowles to England, 251.
- Douay, Felix C., and Confederate colonists, 38.
- Downing, Andrew J., influence on southern architecture, 376-77; system of landscaping, 386-87.
- Du Bois, W. E. Burghardt, 424.
- Dudley, Alexander, proposes sale of Virginia property, 203-204.
- Duff, James, on Charleston stage, 541.
- Duke University, manuscript accessions by library, 284.
- Dumond, Dwight L., on factors in southern history, 467.
- Duncalf, Frederic, 279.
- Dunlap, Leslie W., *American Historical Societies, 1790-1860*, noted, 137.
- Dunmore, Lord, relations with Bowles, 246, 248-50.
- Dunning, William A., influence on southern history, 18-23.
- Durkin, Joseph T., (ed.), *John Dooley, Confederate Soldier: His War Journal*, revd., 568-69.
- Earle, Alice Morse, 424.
- Early, Jubal A., raids along the Potomac, 54, 56; in Confederate colony in Mexico, 38, 50; record of an interview with, 547-63.
- Early Georgia Magazines: Literary Periodicals to 1865*, by Bertram H. Flanders, revd., 112-14.
- East Tennessee Historical Society, meetings noted, 129, 281, 574.
- Eaton, Clement, 439, 570; synopsis of paper by, 87-88.
- Eckenrode, Hamilton J., revs. Jones' *Ranger Mosby*, 119-20.
- Edsall, Preston W., 127, 439.
- Education, Washington's attitude toward, 484; experiment of Farmers' Alliance in, 504-18.
- Edwards, Harry Stillwell, 460.
- Edwards, John N., in Confederate colony in Mexico, 38.
- "Eighth Annual Meeting of the Southern Historical Association," by Daniel M. Robison, 80-88.
- Ekirch, Arthur A., *The Idea of Progress in America, 1815-1860*, revd., 269-71.
- Elbert County, Ga., group migration from, 173-74.
- Eldridge, Lillie, on Charleston stage, 546.
- Elias Reed*, British ship, captured by Wilkes, 343.
- Elisha Beckwith*, as blockade-runner, 220.
- Ellicott, Andrew, 254.
- Elliott, Claude, 126.
- Elliott, Henry H., and northern business interests, 195, 209.
- Ellis, Elmer, 127.
- Elmore, Franklin H., attitude toward southern manufacturing, 390, 404-405.
- English, William F., 286.
- Enquirer* (Richmond), opposes northern business interests, 206.
- Essay upon the Government of the English Plantations on the Continent of America*

- (1701), ed. by Louis B. Wright, revd., 564-65.
- Etchison, E. Dorsey, consul at Matamoros, 229.
- Evans, Charles, 278.
- Evans, Estwick, statement on stock raising, 152.
- Evening Journal* (Albany), and northern business interests, 188.
- Evening Post* (New York), supports northern business interests, 194, 207; comments on Lincoln's policy, 308.
- Fairfax County, Va., northern business interests in, 187.
- Farish, Hunter D., 440; deceased, 279.
- Farmers' Alliance, in Mississippi politics, 523, 529, 536-37; teaching techniques of, 504-18.
- Farragut, David G., 331.
- Featherstonhaugh, George W., comment on stock raising, 162.
- Federal government, relations with Chesapeake and Ohio canal, 56-60.
- Fendall, J. L., on Charleston stage, 541.
- Ferguson, James S., 126.
- Fighting Joe Hooker*, by Walter H. Hebert, revd., 118-19.
- Fighting Liberal: The Autobiography of George W. Norris*, revd., 434-36.
- Firearms of the Confederacy: The Shoulder Arms, Pistols, and Revolvers of the Confederate Soldier*, by Claude E. Fuller and Richard D. Steuart, noted, 287.
- First Lincoln Campaign*, by Reinhard H. Luthin, revd., 114-15.
- "*First With the Most*" *Forrest*, by Robert S. Henry, revd., 117-18.
- Fischer, Kuno, 5.
- Fisher, Elwood, comments on pamphlet by, 413, 418.
- Fiske, Edward W., and northern business interests, 195.
- Fiske, John, 475.
- Fite, Gilbert C., 572.
- Flanders, Bertram H., *Early Georgia Magazines: Literary Periodicals to 1865*, revd., 112-14.
- Fleming, Walter L., contributions to southern history, 10, 15-16, 19; additions to bibliography of, 424-25.
- Fleming, William P., description of frontier conditions, 160.
- Fling, Fred M., 424.
- Florida, Bowles' operations in, 246-61; frontier conditions in, 159-60; as blockade-running base, 219; support of Underwood candidacy, 240, 243.
- Florida, C.S.S., Wilkes' efforts to capture, 329, 333-37, 344.
- Florida, University of, establishes Yonge Library, 285.
- Florida during the Territorial Days, by Sidney Walter Martin, revd., 267-68.
- Florida Historical Society, annual meeting noted, 575.
- Florida Railroad, interest in blockade-running, 220-21.
- Flournoy, George, in Confederate colonization plans, 35, 39.
- Folch, Vicente, Spanish governor of Florida, 257, 259.
- Folmsbee, Stanley J., 126; revs., *Fighting Liberal: The Autobiography of George W. Norris*, 434-36.
- Footner, Hulbert, *Rivers of the Eastern Shore*, noted, 288.
- Forbes, John, opposition to Bowles, 258-59.
- Ford, John T., leases Charleston Opera House, 546.
- Forey, Elie Frédéric, 215.
- Forrest, Nathan B., biog., revd., 117-18.
- Forsyth, John, comment on southern architecture, 374-75.
- Fort Pickens, attempt to land troops at, 313.
- Fort Sumter, and Lincoln's policy, 297-98, 312-21; defense and demolishing of, 539-40.
- Foster, William O., 440.
- Fox, Dixon Ryan, (coauth.), *The Completion of Independence, 1790-1830*, revd., 262-63.
- Fox, Gustavus V., commands relief expedition to Sumter, 314; Lincoln's comment to, 320; comment on Wilkes, 331.
- France, attitude toward Civil War, 214-15; complaints concerning Wilkes' activities, 334, 343-44, 347.
- Francis, David R., comment on Farmers' Alliance, 517.
- Frantz, A. J., in Mississippi politics, 521.
- Fraser, John, and Company, blockade-running interests of, 219.
- Fraser, Trenholm and Company, blockade-running interests of, 219.
- Freeman, Douglas Southall, 440; *Lee's Lieutenants: A Study in Command*, Vol. III, revd., 121-23.
- Freidel, Frank, 439.
- Fremont, John C., 192.
- French Broad River, as route to livestock market, 161.
- Frontier, southern, migration and settlement on, 147-76.
- Fuller, Claude E., (coauth.), *Firearms of the Confederacy*, noted, 287.
- Furber, G. Holden, 279.
- Gadsden, James, attitude toward southern manufacturing, 390, 405, 411-12.
- Gaines, Francis P., 460.
- Gálvez, Bernardo de, Spanish governor of Louisiana, 248.

- García, Manuel, efforts to capture Bowles, 256-57.
- García y Tassara, Gabriel, Spanish minister to United States, 339.
- Garner, James W., 424; historical work of, 19-20.
- Garrison, Curtis W., (ed.), *The United States, 1865-1900: A Survey of Current Literature*, Vol. II, noted, 288.
- Garrison, William Lloyd, 181, 193.
- George, Henry, 517.
- George, James Z., relation with Mississippi Bourbons, 522, 523-25, 529, 532.
- Georgetown Houses of the Federal Period: Washington, D. C., 1780-1830*, noted, 287.
- Georgia, frontier conditions in, 159-61; support of Underwood's candidacy, 240, 243.
- Germain, Lord George, British colonial secretary, 93-94.
- Gewehr, Wesley M., 439.
- Ghioni and Susini Opera Troupe, appearances at Charleston, 543, 545.
- Giddens, Paul H., 570.
- Gilbert, John V., on Charleston stage, 543-44.
- Gilchrist, Albert W., supports Underwood candidacy, 240.
- Gillmore, Quincy A., commands Federal forces at Charleston, 540.
- Gladstone, Mary, on Charleston stage, 543.
- Glass, Frank P., questions Underwood leaders, 235.
- Godbold, Albea, *The Church College of the Old South*, revd., 271-73.
- Godfrey, James L., 573.
- Golding, Joseph D., and Company, interest in blockade-running, 220.
- Goodwin, Tyler, initiates Underwood candidacy, 234.
- Gordon, Julia Kellogg, and northern business interests, 194.
- Gordon, William, Washington's comments to, 473.
- Gorgas, Josiah, in Mexican War, 103-106.
- Gothic Revival, influence in southern architecture, 376-79, 388.
- Govan, Thomas P., revs. Henry's *"First with the Most"* Forrest, 117-18.
- Graf, Leroy P., 439.
- Grange, influence in Mississippi politics, 529-30, 532, 533-34.
- Graniteville Manufacturing Company, organization and activities of, 394-401; correspondence concerning, 403-23.
- Grant, Ulysses S., and Confederates in Mexico, 34, 38; Early's opinion of, 560-61.
- Gray, John A. C., and northern business interests, 195.
- Great Britain, interest in Bowles, 248, 250-52; attitude toward Civil War, 214; interest in blockade-running, 222-24; complaints concerning Wilkes' activities, 329, 334, 337-43.
- Greek Revival, influence in southern architecture, 376-82, 388.
- Greeley, Horace, 395; supports northern business interests, 194-95.
- Green, Fletcher M., 90, 126, 279; "Some Addenda to 'Walter Lynwood Fleming: Historian of Reconstruction,'" 424-25.
- Green, Philip J., 572.
- Greenback party, in Mississippi politics, 532-33.
- Gregg, Alexander, comment on stock raising, 151.
- Gregg, William, early business interests of, 389-93; organizes Graniteville Company, 394; promotion of southern manufacturing, 185, 394-401; correspondence of, 401-402, 404-406, 407-408, 410-12, 415-23.
- Gregory, Thomas W., as Wilson manager, 244.
- Grenville, Lord, relations with Bowles, 251.
- Gresham, L. Paul, 286.
- Grover, Leonard, grand opera company at Charleston, 543.
- Guide to the Manuscripts of the Wisconsin Historical Society*, ed. by Alice E. Smith, noted, 288.
- Gullander, Magnhilde, 571.
- Hale, Edward E., urges migration to Texas, 191.
- Haley, J. Evetts, *Charles Schreiner, General Merchandise: The Story of a Country Store*, revd., 275-76.
- "Half Century of Southern Historical Scholarship," by Wendell H. Stephenson, 3-32.
- Hall, Ellery L., deceased, 128.
- Hall, Uriel S., and educational program of Farmers' Alliance, 505.
- Hall, William A., and northern business interests, 195.
- Halleck, Henry W., 382.
- Halsell, Willie D., "The Bourbon Period in Mississippi Politics, 1875-1890," 519-37.
- Hamer, Philip M., revs. Williams' *Tennessee during the Revolutionary War*, 107-108.
- Hamilton, Alexander, relation to Washington's political thinking, 469-86.
- Hamilton, J. G. de Roulhac, 86; historical work of, 10, 15, 19.
- Hamilton, John C., 572.
- Hamilton, Peter J., 31.
- Hammond, James H., interest in southern manufacturing, 394-98; correspondence of, 403-18.
- Hammond, Matthew B., 424.
- Hanna, Alfred J., 126, 278; revs. An-

- draws' (ed.) *Jonathan Dickinson's Journal or, God's Protecting Providence*, 565-66; *Recommended Readings for the Florida Centennial*, noted 581-82.
- Hanna, Kathryn Abbey, 82, 89; "Incidents of the Confederate Blockade," 214-29.
- Hansen, Walter J., 572.
- Hardeman, William P., interest in Confederate colony, 37, 40.
- Harmon, Judson, candidate for presidential nomination, 235, 242-43.
- Harris, Isham G., interest in Confederate colonization, 39, 40; leader at Carlota, 48-49; leaves Mexico, 50.
- Harris, Joel Chandler, 458.
- Harris, Wiley P., in Mississippi politics, 521.
- Haskins, Charles H., 424.
- Havana, as blockade-running base, 219; coaling station for Wilkes, 333.
- Hawkins, Benjamin, opposition to Bowles, 259.
- Hawley, Claude E., 573.
- Hawthorne, Alexander T., interest in Mexican colonization, 35.
- Hay, John, reports Lincoln's views, 320-21.
- Hay, Thomas Robson, revs. Freeman's *Lee's Lieutenants: A Study in Command*, Vol. III, 121-23.
- Hayden, Hezekiah S., business associate of Gregg, 391.
- Hayden, Jabez H., Connecticut manufacturer, 391.
- Hayden, Nathaniel, southern business interests, 391-92.
- Hayes, Rutherford B., 187.
- Hebert, Paul O., approves Louisiana unification movement, 363.
- Hebert, Walter H., *Fighting Joe Hooker*, revd., 118-19.
- Heflin, Margaret M., 278.
- Helper, Hinton R., 193.
- Hemphill, W. Edwin, 282.
- Henderson, Archibald, 286.
- Henderson, John B., 507.
- Hennigan, Grace, 279.
- Henry, Edward A., (ed.), *Doctoral Dissertations Accepted by American Universities*, noted, 286.
- Henry, Robert S., 574; "First with the Most" Forrest, revd., 117-18.
- Herald* (New Orleans), attitude toward unification, 354, 367.
- Herald* (New York), and northern business interests, 194, 206.
- Herndon, Dallas T., 16.
- Herndon, Nettie S., 286.
- Herndon, William H., opinion of Lincoln, 297.
- Herring, Helen Sharp, 127.
- Hesseltine, William B., 439.
- Hill, Benjamin H., 493.
- Hill, Daniel H., uses propaganda in textbooks, 495.
- Hill, James D., in Louisiana unification movement, 365.
- Hill, John H., 127.
- Hilldrup, Robert L., 126; revs., Niles' *The James, from Iron Gate to the Sea*, 427-29.
- Hindman, Thomas C., interest in Confederate colony, 37, 45.
- Historical scholarship, development of in South, 3-32, 455-68.
- Hodder, Frank H., 424.
- Hofstadter, Richard, 439.
- Hogen, Mildred E., 286.
- Holmes, Lizzie, on Charleston stage, 541.
- Hooker, Joseph, Early's opinion of, 561; biog., revd., 118-19.
- Hooker, Richard J., 286.
- Hoole, W. Stanley, "Charleston Theatricals during the Tragic Decade, 1860-1869," 538-47; *Sam Slick in Texas*, noted, 581.
- Horn, Stanley F., 278; synopsis of paper by, 83-84; revs. Hebert's *Fighting Joe Hooker*, 118-19.
- House Dividing: Lincoln as President Elect*, by William E. Baringer, revd., 431-33.
- House of Burgesses, instructions to Byrd, 71-73.
- Houston, David F., lecturer on southern history, 7.
- Houston, Sam, offered aid by Lincoln, 312.
- Howard, Charles H., on Charleston stage, 541.
- Howard, Oliver O., Early's comments on, 551.
- Hoxie, Richard L., and Washington aqueduct scandal, 558-59.
- Hoyt, William D., Jr., revs. Bailey's *Thomas Cresap: Maryland Frontiersman*, 264-65.
- Hughes, Melvin C., *County Government in Georgia*, noted, 446-47.
- Humphreys, David, Washington expresses opinion to, 477.
- Hunt, Freeman, interest in Gregg's activities, 399.
- Hunter, David, efforts to occupy Lynchburg, 553-54.
- Hunter, Robert M. T., 493.
- Idea of Progress in America, 1815-1860*, by Arthur A. Ekirch, revd., 269-71.
- Ihne, Wilhelm, 5.
- "Incidents of the Confederate Blockade," by Kathryn Abbey Hanna, 214-29.
- Index to the Maryland Line in the Confederate Army, 1861-1865*, noted, 446.
- Industry, correspondence concerning in South Carolina, 402-23; development of in Mississippi, 534-36.
- Ingle, Edward, early historian of South, 457.

- Ingraham, James H., comment on Louisiana unification movement, 356.
- "Interview with General Jubal A. Early in 1889," ed. by Martin F. Schmitt, 547-63.
- Irons, George V., 571.
- Jackson, Thomas J., 498.
- Jacksonville Historical Society, elects officers, 574.
- James, Charles T., interest in southern manufacturing, 184, 399.
- James (The), from Iron Gate to the Sea*, by Mrs. Blair Niles, revd., 427-29.
- James River Flotilla, commanded by Wilkes, 326-28.
- Jameson, J. Franklin, 424; lecturer at Johns Hopkins, 7.
- Jay, John, Washington expresses opinion to, 477.
- Jay, William, antislavery leader, 182.
- Jeannings, Pierre J., receives Confederate colonists, 37-38.
- Jefferson, Thomas, relation to Washington's political thinking, 469-86; Trent's lecture on, 14; Dodd's interest in, 26, 28.
- Jefferson Davis and His Cabinet*, by Rembert W. Patrick, revd., 116-17.
- Jeffries, William W., "The Civil War Career of Charles Wilkes," 324-48.
- Jensen, Merrill M., 570.
- John C. Calhoun, Nationalist, 1782-1828*, by Charles M. Wiltse, revd., 108-12.
- John Dooley, Confederate Soldier: His War Journal*, ed. by Joseph T. Durkin, revd., 568-69.
- Johns, Clarence D., 571.
- Johns Hopkins University, interest in southern history, 4-8.
- Johnson, Andrew, on southern preachers, 493.
- Johnson, Rossiter, 424.
- Johnson, Thomas C., 126.
- Johnston, Frontis W., 126.
- Jonathan Dickinson's Journal or, God's Protecting Providence*, ed. by Evangeline W. Andrews and Charles M. Andrews, revd., 565-66.
- Jones, James, business partner of Gregg, 392.
- Jones, Virgil C., *Ranger Mosby*, revd., 119-20.
- Jordan, Thomas L., and northern business interests, 208.
- Josephson, Bertha E., (ed.), *Local History: How to Gather It, Write It, and Publish It*, noted, 138.
- Journal of a Southern Student, 1846-48, With Letters of a Later Period*, by Giles J. Patterson, revd., 273-74.
- Juárez, Benito, president of Mexico, 34, 48, 221.
- Kane, Harnett T., *Deep Delta Country*, revd., 274-75.
- Kean, Edmund, on Charleston stage, 540.
- Kellogg, Palmer V., and northern business interests, 196.
- Kellogg, William P., candidate for governor of Louisiana, 349-50.
- Kelso, George Y., in Louisiana unification movement, 358.
- Kendrick, Benjamin B., 19, 278, 460, 571.
- Kennon, Lyman W. V., record of interview with General Early, 549-63.
- Kentucky, University of, manuscript accessions by library, 131.
- Kepler, Frances Reece, (ed.), "A British View of the Siege of Charleston, 1776," 93-103.
- Key West, coaling station for Wilkes, 331, 333.
- Kimball, Marie, 570.
- Kitchin, Claude, defends Underwood, 234.
- Knight, Edgar W., plans documentary history of education in South, 579-80.
- Knight, Homer L., 572.
- Krout, John A., (coauth.), *The Completion of Independence, 1790-1830*, revd., 262-63.
- Kuhlman, A. F., (coed.), *Development of Library Resources and Graduate Work in the Cooperative Universities of the South*, noted, 136.
- L'Abeille* (New Orleans), attitude toward unification, 354, 363.
- Labor, question of white versus slave in manufacturing, 389-401, 408, 414, 417.
- Laboulaye, Edouard, 6.
- Lafayette, Marquis de, Washington expresses opinions to, 471, 475, 478, 481, 483.
- Lamar, Lucius Q. C., appeal to Confederate morale, 493; Bourbon leader in Mississippi, 520-36.
- Land, as a factor in migration, 147-54; proportion improved in South, 163.
- Landscaping, development of in Lower South, 383-87.
- Langley, Georgianna and Lotty, on Charleston stage, 541.
- Lanning, John Tate, 279; (coed.), "A Letter of Marque Issued by William Augustus Bowles," 246-61.
- Laprade, William T., 126.
- Larson, Laurence M., 424.
- Lathrop, Barnes F., 573.
- Lawrence, Amos A., correspondence with Gregg, 399, 420-23.
- Lawrence, James E., introduction to *Fighting Liberal: The Autobiography of George W. Norris*, 434-36.
- Leadbetter, Danville, interest in Confederate colonization, 36.
- Lease, Mary, and Farmers' Alliance, 504.

- Lee, Charles, commands American forces at Charleston, 98.
- Lee, Fitzhugh, 548.
- Lee, Robert E., 33, 328, 492; removal of General Early from command, 548; Trent's study of, 15; Dodd's interest in, 30.
- Lee's Lieutenants: A Study in Command*, Vol. III, *Gettysburg to Appomattox*, by Douglas Southall Freeman, revd., 121-23.
- "Letter of Marque Issued by William Augustus Bowles as Director General of the State of Muskogee," ed. by Duvon C. Corbitt and John Tate Lanning, 246-61.
- Lewis, James, Negro leader in Louisiana unification movement, 355, 365-67.
- Lewis, William A., in Confederate colonization plans, 35.
- Library of Congress, manuscript accessions of, 284, 442-43, 577-78.
- Lieber, Francis, 6.
- Lillard, Richard G., 570.
- Lincoln, Abraham, 34, 215; and strategy of defense, 297-323; relations with Wilkes, 326, 348; Dodd's interest in, 28, 30; books on, revd., 114-15, 429-33.
- "Lincoln and the Strategy of Defense in the Crisis of 1861," by Kenneth M. Stampp, 297-323.
- Lincoln Bibliography, 1839-1939*, Vols. I and II, comp. by Jay Monaghan, revd., 429-31.
- Lind, Jenny, on Charleston stage, 540.
- Lindgren, Raymond E., 279.
- Link, Arthur S., 440; "The Underwood Presidential Movement of 1912," 230-45.
- Livestock raising, importance of on southern frontier, 149-76.
- Local History: How to Gather It, Write It, and Publish It*, by Donald D. Parker, noted 138.
- Long, Armistead L., Early criticizes book by, 561.
- Longstreet, James, Early's opinion of, 561.
- Lonn, Ella, 81, 89, 90; *The Colonial Agents of the Southern Colonies*, revd., 426-27.
- Louisiana Historical Society, meetings noted, 130, 281.
- Louisiana State University, accessions by Department of Archives, 282.
- "Louisiana Unification Movement of 1873," by T. Harry Williams, 349-69.
- Lower South, plantation architecture in, 370-88.
- Lowry, Robert, in Mississippi politics, 528, 532.
- Luthin, Reinhard H., *The First Lincoln Campaign*, revd., 114-15.
- Lux, John G., interest in Confederate colonization, 41.
- Lynch, William O., 86.
- Lynchburg, Va., defense of, 553-54; Kennon's impression of, 554-55.
- Lyons, Lord, British minister to United States, 339; complaints concerning Wilkes' activities, 340-41, 344, 346.
- Mabry, William A., 126.
- Macaulay, Zachary, sends Bowles to England, 254.
- Macbeth, Charles, mayor of Charleston, 541.
- McBrien, D. D., 439.
- McCain, William D., 127, 441, 571.
- McCardle, William H., in Mississippi politics, 520-21.
- McClellan, George B., 326, 498; Early's opinion of, 561.
- McCloy, Shelby T., 572.
- McCombs, William F., as Wilson manager, 244.
- McDuffie, George, interest in southern manufacturing, 390-92; letters from, 402-403.
- McEnery, John, candidate for governor of Louisiana, 349.
- McFadyen, Christiana, 571.
- McGann, Sister Agnes Geraldine, 286.
- McGillivray, Alexander, relations with Bowles, 246, 249-50.
- McGinty, Garnie W., 126.
- McIlwain, Charles H., 424.
- McKaye, James M., and northern business interests, 196.
- McLean, Ross H., 126.
- McMaster, John B., 459.
- Macmillan, Margaret B., 286.
- Macon, Nathaniel, Dodd's interest in, 26-27.
- Macready, William, on Charleston stage, 540.
- McVey, Frank L., 424; publication of addresses and articles, noted, 137.
- Madison, James, relation to Washington's political thinking, 469, 475, 480, 485-86.
- Maffitt, J. Newland, commander of C.S.S. *Florida*, 333, 336.
- Magruder, John B., interest in Confederate colony, 37-38; Mexican colonization official, 40; leaves Mexico, 50.
- Making of a Downtown Church*, by Wyndham B. Blanton, noted, 447.
- Malone, Dumas, 572.
- Manufacturing, Washington's attitude toward, 481; development of in South Carolina, 389-423.
- Marchant, G. F., theatre manager in Charleston, 539, 540.
- Marie, as blockade-runner, 220.
- Marion County, Ala., factors in migration to, 170-71.
- Marks, Isaac N., reform leader in Louisiana, 351; promotes unification, 356-57, 363, 365.
- Martin, D. Randolph, and northern business interests, 195.

- Martin, James W., *Southern State and Local Finance Trends and the War*, noted 580-81.
- Martin, Sidney Walter, 126, 572; *Florida during the Territorial Days*, revd., 267-68.
- Martin, Thomas P., (ed.), "The Advent of William Gregg and the Graniteville Company," 389-423.
- Martinique, Wilkes' operations around, 343.
- Mary, Aristide, in Louisiana unification movement, 358.
- Marye, Lawrence S., friend of General Early, 555-62.
- Maryland, Confederate raids into, 54, 56; relations with Chesapeake and Ohio canal, 61, 64.
- Maryland Historical Society, manuscript acquisitions, 132, 283, 444-45.
- Mason, Charles H., comment on Gregg, 399.
- Mason, James M., Confederate commissioner, 325.
- Matamoros, as center of blockade-running activities, 219, 221-29.
- Mathews, Shailer, 424.
- Matthews, John C., 278.
- Maury, Matthew F., Mexican commissioner of colonization, 39-40; promotes Confederate plans, 41-43, 46; departure from Mexico, 47, 50.
- Maury, Richard L., Mexican colonization official, 47.
- Maury County, Tenn., group migration to, 172.
- Maximilian, Archduke, interest in Confederate colony, 33-50.
- May, Earl Chapin, *Principio to Wheeling, 1715-1945: A Pageant of Iron and Steel*, revd., 567-68.
- Mayo, Bernard, revs. Wiltse's *John C. Calhoun, Nationalist*, 108-12.
- Meade, Robert D., 126, 570.
- Meigs, Montgomery C., sent to Fort Pickens, 314.
- Meisen, Adolph F., 572.
- Mejía, Tomás, in command at Matamoros, 229.
- Memminger, Christopher G., attitude toward southern manufacturing, 396; letter from, 413-14.
- Meriwether, Colyer, 15.
- Mexican Times*, Confederate newspaper in Mexico, 40, 44, 47, 49.
- Mexican War, Josiah Gorgas in, 103-106.
- Mexico, attitude toward blockade-running, 221-29; complaints concerning Wilkes' activities, 334, 343-44; Confederate colony in, 33-50.
- Miccosukee, headquarters of Bowles' state, 257-58, 261.
- Midwest Pioneer: His Ills, Cures, and Doctors*, by Madge E. Pickard and R. Carlyle Buley, revd., 265-67.
- Migration, motives for on southern frontier, 147-49.
- Milfort, Louis LeClerc, 252.
- Miller, Bonnamy and Company, relations with Bowles, 248-49, 250, 252.
- Miller, John, British merchant, 248.
- Milne, Alexander, British vice admiral, relations with Wilkes, 342-43, 346.
- Miró, Estevan, relations with Bowles, 249, 253.
- Mississippi, frontier conditions in, 156-58; Bourbon politics in, 519-37; economic conditions in, 534-36.
- Mississippi Department of Archives and History, manuscript acquisitions, 444.
- Mississippi Historical Society, revived by Riley, 17.
- Missouri, activities of Farmers' Alliance in, 505, 509, 513-18.
- Missouri, University of, manuscript accessions by library, 131, 443-44, 578-79.
- Missouri Compromise, Lincoln objects to restoration of, 299.
- Missouri Historical Society, manuscript accessions, 283.
- Mitchell, Harry A., 286.
- Mitchell, Mary E., 572.
- Moffitt, James W., 572.
- Monaghan, Jay, (comp.), *Lincoln Bibliography, 1839-1939*, revd., 429-31.
- Monks, George R., 572.
- Mont Blanc*, British ship, capture by Wilkes, 343.
- Montgomery, C. C., 127.
- Moore, Albert B., 16.
- Moore, Ike H., deceased, 573.
- Moore, Mrs. M. B., uses propaganda in textbooks, 495.
- Moore, Thomas O., interest in Confederate colony, 36, 39.
- Morgan, Edwin B., and northern business interests, 196.
- Morgan, Edwin D., political interest in northern colonization, 212.
- Morison, Samuel E., 464.
- Mormon migration, Bowen's comment on, 190.
- Morro Castle, Bowles imprisoned in, 257, 259.
- Mosby, John S., raids of, 54, 56; biog., revd., 119-20.
- Moultrie, William, in defense of Charleston, 98.
- Mouton, Alexandre, approves Louisiana unification movement, 363.
- Mowatt, Anna Cora, on Charleston stage, 540.
- Mowry, George E., 127.
- Muldraw, Henry L., in Mississippi politics, 529, 532.
- Mullett, Charles F., 127.
- Munford, Thomas T., friend of General Early, 557-58.

- Murdock, James E., on Charleston stage, 539.
- Murrah, Pendleton, interest in Confederate colonization, 36, 38, 40.
- Murray, Paul, 572.
- Muskogee, Indian state established by Bowles, 246, 254-61.
- Muskogee Mekko*, privateer commissioned by Bowles, 258, 260-61.
- Napoleon III, attitude toward Civil War, 215.
- Nassau, as blockade-running base, 219; accused of aiding Confederacy, 336; Wilkes' attempt to blockade, 342.
- National Archives, accessions by, 135-36, 284-85, 576-77; sponsors training program, 285-86; other activities of, 445-46.
- National Intelligencer* (Washington), promotes northern business interests, 206.
- National Reform Press Association, and Farmers' Alliance, 510, 513.
- Negroes, interest in Louisiana unification movement, 350-68.
- Nelson, Robert, comment on southern gardens, 384-85.
- New England Emigrant Aid Company, organization of, 190-91; interest in Kansas, 191-92.
- New Orleans, interest in unification movement, 352, 356-59, 362-66.
- Newberry Library, manuscript accessions by, 131.
- Newton County, Miss., factors in migration to, 170.
- Nichols, Madaline W., 572.
- Nicholson, Francis, colonial governor of Virginia, 69; Byrd's opposition to, 69-79.
- Nicolay, John G., records Lincoln's views, 303, 320-21.
- Niles, Hezekiah, on slave employment, 180.
- Niles, Mrs. Blair, *The James, from Iron Gate to the Sea*, revd., 427-29.
- Nixon, H. Clarence, 16; revs. Haley's *Charles Schreiner, General Merchandise*, 275-76; *The Tennessee Valley; A Recreation Domain*, noted, 446.
- Noblin, Stuart, 572.
- Norris, George W., autobiography, revd., 434-36.
- North American Emigrant Aid and Homestead Company, organization of, 195; promotes colonization of Upper South, 196-211.
- North Carolina, stock raising in, 161-62.
- North Carolina, University of, manuscript acquisitions by library, 132-35, 575-76.
- North Carolina Department of Archives and History, manuscript acquisitions of, 131, 283, 444; biennial report, noted, 136.
- North Carolina State Literary and Historical Association, meeting noted, 280.
- Northern business interests, attempts to "redeem" Upper South, 177-213.
- "Note on Josiah Gorgas in the Mexican War," by Frank E. Vandiver, 103-106.
- Nuttall, Thomas, statement on stock raising, 152.
- Ogg, Frederic A., 424.
- Old Northwest, statistics of stock raising in, 164-65.
- Olivier, Pedro, efforts to capture Bowles, 256-57.
- Olmsted, Frederick Law, on southern stock raising, 162; comments on southern architecture, 370-71.
- Oneida*, U.S.S., detained by Wilkes, 331.
- O'Neill, James, on Charleston stage, 546.
- Ord, H. St. George, British governor of Bermuda, 340; trouble with Wilkes, 340-41.
- Osborn, George C., revs. Daniels' *The Wilson Era: Years of Peace*, 276-77.
- Owen, Thomas M., historical interests of, 31; publicity director for Underwood, 236.
- Owsley, Frank L., 16, 83, 126, 488; "The Pattern of Migration and Settlement on the Southern Frontier," 147-76; (coauth.), *A Short History of the American People*, noted, 446.
- Ozark Mountains, source of migration to, 165.
- Page, Thomas Nelson, 458.
- Palmer, Sir Roundell, comment on Confederate blockade, 217.
- Panton, Leslie and Company, Bowles' relations with, 246, 249-50, 252.
- Panton, William, relations with Bowles, 249-50, 255, 258.
- Pargellis, Stanley, revs. Wright's (ed.) *An Essay upon the Government of the English Plantations on the Continent of America (1701)*, 564-65.
- Parker, Donald D., *Local History: How to Gather It, Write It, and Publish It*, noted, 138.
- Parker, Sir Peter, in siege of Charleston, 93-103.
- Parkes, George S., revives drama in Charleston, 541-42.
- Parks, Joseph H., 126.
- Parsons, Monroe, in Confederate colony, 38.
- Patrick, Rembert W., 573; *Jefferson Davis and His Cabinet*, revd., 116-17.
- Patron of Husbandry*, Grange newspaper, influence in Mississippi politics, 529-30, 532, 533-34.
- "Pattern of Migration and Settlement on

- the Southern Frontier," by Frank L. Owsley, 147-76.
- Patterson, Giles J., *Journal of a Southern Student, 1846-48, With Letters of a Later Period*, revd., 273-74.
- Patti, Adelina, on Charleston stage, 539.
- Patton, James W., 90; "Annual Report of the Secretary-Treasurer," 89-92; revs. Patterson's *Journal of a Southern Student*, 273-74.
- Peabody, Charles A., campaign to improve southern homes, 372, 377; advice on landscaping, 384, 386-87.
- Peck, John M., describes frontier interests, 149-50, 152, 168.
- Peevy, Lucien E., 127.
- Peffer, William A., leader in Farmers' Alliance, 505, 510.
- Pensacola, base of operations against Bowles, 252, 256-57; Federal reinforcements sent to, 313.
- Perche, Napoleon J., Catholic archbishop, supports Louisiana unification movement, 363.
- Perkins, Howard C., revs. Baringer's *A House Dividing: Lincoln as President Elect*, 431-33.
- Perkins, John, interest in Confederate colonization, 40, 48.
- Peterhoff, British ship, seizure of, 223, 337; significance of case, 224, 338, 345, 347.
- Petrie, George, influence on southern students, 15-16.
- Pfaff, Eugene E., 278, 571.
- Phases of the History of the Supreme Court of Tennessee*, by Samuel C. Williams, noted, 447.
- Philips, Martin W., condition of home, 372.
- Phillips, Adelaide, on Charleston stage, 539.
- Phillips, Ulrich B., contributions to southern history, 10, 15, 19, 23-26, 457, 463.
- Picayune (New Orleans), attitude toward unification, 353-54, 363, 366.
- Pickard, Madge E., (coauth.), *The Midwest Pioneer: His Ills, Cures, and Doctors*, revd., 265-67.
- Pickering, Timothy, Washington expresses opinion to, 479.
- Piper, Edward, Count, presents Danish complaints, 345-46.
- Pitchfork Ben Tillman: South Carolinian*, by Francis B. Simkins, revd., 123-25.
- Plain Dealer* (Cleveland), criticizes Lincoln, 316.
- "Plantation Architecture of the Lower South on the Eve of the Civil War," by James C. Bonner, 370-88.
- Point Isabel, Federal force at, 227.
- "Political Thinking of George Washington," by Harold W. Bradley, 469-86.
- Polk, Leonidas L., president of Southern Alliance, 512.
- Pond, George E., Early's opinion of book by, 560.
- Pope, John, 328; Early's opinion of, 561.
- Port Royal, capture by Federals, 539.
- Portell, Tomás, surrenders to Bowles, 257.
- Portraiture in the Virginia Historical Society*, noted, 447.
- Posey, Walter B., 278, 439; revs. Godbold's *The Church College of the Old South*, 271-73.
- Poteet, James H., 126, 571.
- Potomac Company, early plans for canal, 52.
- Potomac River Flotilla, Wilkes in command of, 328.
- Powderly, Terence V., 510.
- Powell, Leven, Dodd's interest in, 27.
- Powell, Nettie, on migration to Georgia, 170-71.
- Preston, William, interest in Mexican colonization, 35, 37.
- Price, Sterling, interest in Confederate colonization, 38, 40; leader at Carlota, 45, 48-49; leaves Mexico, 50.
- Principio to Wheeling, 1715-1945: A Pageant of Iron and Steel*, by Earl Chapin May, revd., 567-68.
- Privy Council, advice on colonial affairs, 72.
- Progressive movement, early leaders of, 504.
- "Propaganda in the Confederacy," by James W. Silver, 487-503.
- Prussia, attitude toward Civil War, 215.
- Public lands, extent of in South, 147-49.
- Quaife, Milo M., 424.
- Queener, Verton M., 439.
- Quynn, Dorothy M., 572.
- Rafinesque, Constantine S., republication of *A Life of Travel*, noted, 136-37.
- Railroads, plans for in South Carolina, 405; effect of Civil War on business of, 51-52.
- Ralph, Philip, 127.
- Ramsdell, Charles W., historical work of, 19-21; on factors in southern history, 467; on propaganda in the Confederacy, 487, 488.
- Ramsey, John F., 439.
- Ranck, James B., 439.
- Randall, James G., 126; foreword to *Lincoln Bibliography*, 429; delivers Fleming lectures, 438.
- Randolph, John, Trent's lecture on, 14; Petrie's interest in, 16.
- Randolph, William M., reform leader in Louisiana, 351; promotes unification, 357-58.
- Ranger Mosby*, by Virgil C. Jones, revd., 119-20.
- Rath, Reuben J., 572.
- Raymond, Kate, on Charleston stage, 544.

- Read, Mark, on Charleston stage, 544.
- Ream, Vinnie, makes statue of General Lee, 559.
- Recommended Readings for the Florida Centennial*, by Alfred J. Hanna, noted, 581-82.
- Reconstruction, studies by Dunning students, 19-22; problems of in Louisiana, 349-69.
- Redmond, Dennis, comments on southern architecture, 379, 383.
- Reed, Thomas B., 505.
- Reform party, organized in Louisiana, 351.
- Reinsch, Paul S., 424.
- Republican* (New Orleans), attitude toward unification, 355, 362.
- Republican* (Springfield), supports northern colonization, 198; comments on Lincoln's policy, 308, 311.
- Republican party, and Lincoln's strategy of defense, 300-301, 316-17, 319, 322-23; and unification in Louisiana, 355, 362, 364, 368.
- Reynolds, Alfred W., 16.
- Reynolds, Hughes, *The Coosa River Valley from De Soto to Hydroelectric Power*, revd., 434.
- Reynolds, Thomas C., interest in Confederate colony, 36, 37, 38, 45.
- Rice, Madeleine H., 286.
- Richardson, Simon P., description of frontier conditions, 159-60.
- Richmond*, C.S.S., Wilkes to repel, 327.
- Ridley, Alonzo, interest in Confederate colonization, 41.
- Riley, Franklin L., historical activities of, 16-17.
- Rio Grande, used in blockade-running, 221-29.
- Rister, Carl C., 126, 571; "Carlota, A Confederate Colony in Mexico," 33-50.
- Ritchie, Thomas, Dodd's interest in, 27, 28.
- Rivers of the Eastern Shore: Seventeen Maryland Rivers*, by Hulbert Footner, noted, 288.
- Roane, Spencer, Dodd's interest in, 27, 28.
- Roberts, Oran M., interest in Confederate colonization, 41.
- Robertson, Thomas W., play by, presented at Charleston, 546.
- Robinson, Mrs. Dana Fulcher, 440.
- Robinson, Solon, comment on white labor, 396.
- Robison, Daniel M., 126; "The Eighth Annual Meeting of the Southern Historical Association," 80-88.
- Rollins, James S., 507.
- Romero, Matias, protests against blockade, 225.
- Ross, Earle D., 129.
- Rosser, Thomas L., Early's comments on, 560, 561.
- Rothe, Louis, Danish official at St. Thomas, 344; complaints to Wilkes, 344-45.
- Rothert, Otto A., 278.
- Roudanez, Louis C., Negro leader in Louisiana unification movement, 355, 358.
- "Round About Town," newspaper reporter, 352; promotes Louisiana unification movement, 352-53.
- R. R. Cuyler, U.S.S., detained by Wilkes, 331.
- Ruiz, Manuel, causes trouble on Rio Grande, 227-28.
- Russell, Lord John, comments on blockade, 224, 338-39.
- Russell County, Ala., beginning of settlement in, 158.
- Russia, attitude toward Civil War, 215.
- Ryan, Thomas F., support of Underwood, 236.
- Ryswick, treaty of, effect on colonial problems, 70, 74, 78.
- St. Clair, Kenneth E., 572.
- St. Pierre, base of operations for Wilkes, 343.
- St. Thomas, Wilkes' operations around, 344, 347.
- Sam Slick in Texas*, by W. Stanley Hoole, noted 581.
- Sanderlin, Walter S., "The Vicissitudes of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal during the Civil War," 51-67.
- Sanford, Rollin, and northern business interests, 195, 202-205.
- Scharf, J. Thomas, interest in southern history, 6.
- Schmitt, Martin F., (ed.), "An Interview with General Jubal A. Early in 1889," 547-63.
- Scholes, Walter V., 440.
- Schoolcraft, John L., and northern business interests, 196.
- Scott, Winfield, 104, 105; contact with Lincoln, 303, 312.
- Scroggs, William O., 16.
- Seabrook, William B., requests information on manufacturing, 399; letter to, 419.
- Semmes, Raphael, commander of C.S.S. *Alabama*, 333, 336.
- Sensabaugh, Leon F., 571.
- Settle, William A., 572.
- Sewanee Review*, reflected southern scholarship, 12, 15.
- Seward, William H., 34, 48; and northern business interests, 196, 212; and Confederate blockade, 215, 217, 223; proposal rejected by Lincoln, 305, 318; relations with Wilkes, 326, 340-42, 346-47.
- Shanks, Henry T., 82, 90, 126.
- Shays' Rebellion, Washington's reaction to, 474.
- Sheets, Elizabeth, letter from on Gregg's family, 401-402.
- Shelby, Joseph O., leader in Confederate colony in Mexico, 35-50.

- Sheridan, Philip H., and Confederates in Mexico, 34, 38, 46-48; Early's comments on, 553, 559-60.
- Sherman, Thomas W., captures Port Royal, 539.
- Sherman, William T., 215; false report of death, 499.
- Short History of the American People*, by Oliver P. Chitwood and Frank L. Owsley, noted, 466.
- Showerman, Grant, 424.
- Shryock, Richard H., on cultural factors in southern history, 464-65.
- Sigaud, Louis A., *Belle Boyd, Confederate Spy*, noted, 287-88.
- Silas Henry, as blockade runner, 220.
- Silver, James W., 126, 279; synopsis of paper by, 81-82; "Propaganda in the Confederacy," 487-503.
- Simkins, Francis B., 126; *Pitchfork Ben Tillman: South Carolinian*, revd., 123-25.
- Simmons, James F., 392.
- Simms, William Gilmore, interest in southern manufacturing, 395-96; letters to, 406-407, 409-10, 416; and the Charleston theatre, 546; significance of Trent's biography of, 12-13.
- Simpson, James, author of document on siege of Charleston, 93-94.
- Simpson, Jeremiah, and Farmers' Alliance, 504.
- Singleton, Otho R., in Mississippi politics, 520, 532.
- Sioussat, St. George L., 15, 424.
- Sitterson, J. Carlyle, 573.
- Skaggs, Marvin L., 440.
- Skipper, Ottis C., 126.
- Slaughter, James E., Confederate commander on Rio Grande, 228-29; in Carolina colony, 45.
- Slavery, attitude of economic theorists on, 179-81; Trent's attitude on, 14-15.
- Slaves, use of in cotton mills, 395, 397-98, 413-14.
- Slidell, John, Confederate commissioner, 325.
- Sloman, John, on Charleston stage, 541.
- Smith, Alice E., (ed.), *Guide to the Manuscripts of the Wisconsin Historical Society*, noted, 288.
- Smith, Charles E., 571.
- Smith, E. Kirby, 548; interest in Mexican colonization, 35-39.
- Smith, George Winston, "Ante-Bellum Attempts of Northern Business Interests to 'Redeem' the Upper South," 177-213.
- Smith, Hamilton, interest in southern manufacturing, 396-97; letters from, 412-13, 418.
- Smith, Henry Nash, 572.
- Smith, Truman, and northern business interests, 195.
- Smith, William K., proposes sale of Virginia property, 203-204.
- Soil, as a factor in migration, 166-68.
- "Some Addenda to 'Walter Lynwood Fleming: Historian of Reconstruction,'" by Fletcher M. Green, 424-25.
- Sothorn, Edward A., on Charleston stage, 539.
- South, migration and settlement in, 147-76; improved land in, 163; statistics of stock raising in, 164-65; development of cotton mills in, 389-423; plantation architecture in, 370-88; northern business and attempt to "redeem," 177-213; and Farmers' Alliance, 504-18; and Underwood's candidacy, 230-45; historical scholarship in, 3-32, 455-68.
- South Atlantic Quarterly*, contributions to southern history, 8, 10, 15.
- South Carolina, group migration from, 171-72; development of manufacturing in, 389-423.
- South Carolina, University of, activities of South Caroliniana Library, 445.
- South Carolina: Economic and Social*, ed. by Wilfrid H. Callcott, revd., 436-37.
- South Carolina Historical Society, elects of officers, 441-42.
- Southern Baptist Convention, and Confederate propaganda, 494.
- "Southern Experiment in Writing Social History," by Charles S. Sydnor, 455-68.
- Southern frontier, migration and settlement on, 147-76.
- Southern Historical Association, report on eighth annual meeting, 80-88; report of secretary-treasurer, 89-92; finances of, 91-92; committee appointments, 126, 278; cancellation of 1945 meeting, 278.
- Southern State and Local Finance Trends and the War*, by James W. Martin, noted, 580-81.
- Spain, opposition to Bowles, 249-59; complaints concerning Wilkes' activities, 334, 339.
- Sparks, Edwin E., 27, 424.
- Sparks, William H., description of frontier conditions, 157-58, 166.
- Spates, Alfred, officer of Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company, 63.
- Spates, George, charges of disloyalty against, 63.
- Spears, Ione P., 573.
- Spence, David E., friend of General Early, 555.
- Springbok*, British ship, seizure of, 337; significance of case, 338, 345, 347.
- Stamp, Kenneth M., 571; "Lincoln and the Strategy of Defense in the Crisis of 1861," 297-323.
- Standish, William, in Confederate colony in Mexico, 38.
- Staples, Thomas S., 19.
- Stephens, Alexander H., 493; condition of home, 372-73; Trent's lecture on, 14; Petrie's interest in, 16.

- Stephenson, Wendell H., 86, 438; "A Half Century of Southern Historical Scholarship," 3-32.
- Stetson, Charles A., and northern business interests, 195.
- Steuart, Richard D., (coauth.), *Firearms of the Confederacy*, noted, 287.
- Stevens, Walter H., in Carlotia colony, 45; dies in Mexico, 50.
- Stone, John M., in Mississippi politics, 528, 532.
- Strahan, C. G., revives drama in Charleston, 541-42.
- Stringfellow, W. H., interest in blockade-running, 220.
- Sullivan, Roger, in Baltimore convention, 244.
- Summers, Festus P., 126; revs. May's *Principio to Wheeling, 1715-1945: A Pageant of Iron and Steel*, 567-68.
- Swann, William A., blockade-running activities of, 219-21.
- Swint, Henry L., 89; revs., Reynolds' *The Coosa River Valley from De Soto to Hydroelectric Power*, 434.
- Sydnor, Charles S., 84, 278, 572; "The Southern Experiment in Writing Social History," 455-68; revs. Krout and Fox's *The Completion of Independence*, 262-63.
- Taft, William H., 231.
- Tait, Charles, plans for migration, 173.
- Tait, James A., migration to Alabama, 173.
- Taliaferro, William B., friend of General Early, 557.
- Tallant, James G., 286.
- Tappan, Lewis, antislavery leader, 182.
- Taylor, A. Elizabeth, 573.
- Taylor, James H., owner of South Carolina cotton mill, 399.
- Taylor, John, Dodd's interest in, 27, 28.
- Taylor, Rosser H., 126.
- "Teaching Techniques of the Farmers' Alliance: An Experiment in Adult Education," by Homer Clevenger, 504-18.
- Templeton, John, on Charleston stage, 543-44.
- Tennessee during the Revolutionary War*, by Samuel C. Williams, revd., 107-108.
- Tennessee Historical Society, meeting noted, 130.
- Tennessee Valley: A Recreation Domain*, by H. Clarence Nixon, noted, 446.
- Terrell, Alexander W., in Confederate colony in Mexico, 39, 40.
- Texan Emigration and Land Company, 190.
- Texas, University of, manuscript acquisitions by library, 579.
- Texas State Historical Association, annual meeting noted, 574; plans handbook, 441.
- Thaxton, J. Ralph, 126.
- Thayer, Eli, urges northern colonization, 191-92; interest in Upper South, 193-211.
- Theatricals in Charleston during Civil War, 538-47.
- Thomas, Alfred B., 279, 571.
- Thomas, David Y., 19, 424.
- Thomas Cresap: Maryland Frontiersman*, by Kenneth P. Bailey, revd., 264-65.
- Thomas Jefferson's Garden Book, 1766-1824*, noted, 287.
- Thompson, Charles H., in Louisiana unification movement, 358.
- Thompson, C. Mildred, 19, 20.
- Thompson, E. Bruce, 572.
- Thompson, Holland, 10.
- Thompson, Jacob, withdraws from politics, 520.
- Tillie, Annie, on Charleston stage, 541.
- Tillman, Benjamin R., and Farmers' Alliance, 504; biog., revd., 123-25.
- Times* (New Orleans), promotes unification movement, 352-56, 366-67.
- Tompkins, Stuart R., 439.
- Toombs, Robert, 520; Trent's lecture on 14; Petrie's interest in, 16; Phillips' interest in, 24.
- Torbert, Alfred T. A., Early's comment on, 560.
- Totten, Silas, comments on northern settlers, 189.
- Treat, Payson J., 424.
- Treitschke, Heinrich von, 5, 19.
- Trent, William P., interest in southern history, 3, 12-15.
- Trent affair, 324-25, 338.
- Trexler, Harrison A., revs. Patrick's *Jefferson Davis and His Cabinet*, 116-17.
- Tribune* (New York), supports northern business interests, 194.
- Trinity College, interest in southern history, 8-12, 17, 18.
- Trinity College Historical Society, activities of, 9-10.
- True, Wallace M., deceased, 128.
- Trumbull, Lyman, correspondence with Lincoln, 299.
- Tucker, Henry, effect of sermons as propaganda, 494.
- Tullis, Coral H., 573.
- Turner, Frederick J., 424; influence on Phillips, 23-24.
- Tuthill, Edward, 439.
- Underwood, John C., promoter of northern interests in Upper South, 192-213.
- Underwood, Joseph R., senator from Kentucky, 230.
- Underwood, Oscar W., early life, 230; as Democratic leader in Congress, 231-32; conflict with Bryan, 232-34; candidate for presidential nomination, 234-45.
- "Underwood Presidential Movement of 1912," by Arthur S. Link, 230-45.
- Unification movement in Louisiana, 349-69.

- United Nation of Creeks and Cherokees, created by Bowles, 251.
- United States, 1865-1900: A Survey of Current Literature*, Vol. II, ed. by Curtis W. Garrison, noted, 288.
- Upper South, interest of northern business men in, 177-213.
- Vance, Zebulon B., on southern morale, 488, 503; Lee appeals to, 492.
- Vanderbilt*, U.S.S., Wilkes' detention of, 330-31, 336, 347; captures *Peterhoff*, 223.
- Vandiver, Frank E., "A Note on Josiah Gorgas in the Mexican War," 103-106.
- Vane, Alice and Isabel, on Charleston stage, 543.
- Van Sickle, John V., revs., Callcott's (ed.) *South Carolina: Economic and Social*, 436-37.
- Vaucluse Manufacturing Company, activities of, 390-92; correspondence concerning, 402-403.
- Vaughn, John C., Early's comment on, 560.
- Venable, Austin L., 126, 572.
- Venable, Charles S., 562.
- Vera Cruz, American capture of, 104; ordnance depot at, 105-106.
- "Vicissitudes of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal during the Civil War," by Walter S. Sanderlin, 51-67.
- Victor*, British vessel, seized by Wilkes, 339.
- Vidal de La Blache, Paul M. J., comment on migration factors, 166.
- Viles, Jonas, 438.
- Villard, Henry, comments on Lincoln, 302-303.
- Virginia, complaints on colonial government in, 68-79; northern attempts to "redeem," 177-213.
- Virginia, University of, manuscript acquisitions by library, 130-31, 577.
- Virginia* (or *Noe Daquy*), controversy concerning nationality of, 344.
- Virginia War History Commission, activities of, 281-82.
- Wachusett*, U.S.S., used by Wilkes at Nasau, 342, 345.
- Wadsworth, James S., and northern business interests, 196, 206.
- Wagstaff, Henry M., deceased, 440.
- Walker, Franklin T., 286.
- Walker, James, on Charleston stage, 542.
- Wallace, David D., 15.
- Wallace, Lew, reports on Confederate activities, 34.
- Walthall, Edward C., Bourbon leader in Mississippi, 523, 527, 532.
- Wardell, Morris L., 571.
- Ware County, Ga., stock raising in, 160-61.
- Warmoth, Henry C., 358.
- Washington, Bushrod, 475, 476.
- Washington, George, interest in Potomac Company, 52; political thinking of, 469-86.
- Watkins, Howard, on Charleston stage, 543.
- Watson, John W. C., in Mississippi politics, 521.
- Watson, Thomas E., and Farmers' Alliance, 505; supports Underwood's candidacy, 239-40.
- Weaver, James B., leader in Farmers' Alliance, 505, 510.
- Webb, Walter P., 441, 571.
- Webber, Gladys, 571.
- Weddell, Alexander W., 447.
- Weed, Thurlow, 300; interest in northern Virginia, 188.
- Welles, Gideon, secretary of navy, relations with Wilkes, 326-48.
- Wells, Henry, and northern business interests, 196.
- Wertenbaker, Thomas J., work in southern history, 15, 32.
- West India Squadron, Wilkes placed in command of, 328; operations of, 333-47.
- West Indies, Wilkes establishes coaling stations in, 333; naval operations in, 333-47.
- West Point Land Company, sale of property proposed, 203.
- Wheeler, Joseph, 548.
- Wbig* (Richmond), and northern business interests, 202.
- White, Elijah V., raids of, 54, 56.
- White, Hugh, and northern business interests, 196.
- White, William N., suggestion on landscaping, 384.
- Wickham, Williams C., Early's comment on, 560.
- Wigfall, Louis T., in Confederate colonization plans, 35.
- Wilcox, Cadmus M., interest in Confederate colonization, 37, 39.
- Wilcox County, Ala., group migration to, 173-74.
- Wiley, Bell I., revs. Durkin's (ed.) *John Dooley, Confederate Soldier: His War Journal*, 568-69.
- Wiley, Evelyn, 127.
- Wilkes, Charles, early naval career, 324-25; in *Trent* affair, 325; in command of home squadrons, 326-28; operations in West Indies, 329-46; court martial of, 347; retired, 348.
- "William Byrd's Opposition to Governor Francis Nicholson," by Louis B. Wright, 68-79.
- Williams, Amelia W., 127.

- Williams, John Sharp, comment on southern history, 462-63.
- Williams, Samuel C., *Tennessee during the Revolutionary War*, revd., 107-108; *Phases of the History of the Supreme Court of Tennessee*, noted, 447.
- Williams, T. Harry, 88, 127; "The Louisiana Unification Movement of 1873," 349-69; revs. Luthin's *The First Lincoln Campaign*, 114-15; revs. Monaghan's (comp.) *Lincoln Bibliography, 1839-1939*, 429-31.
- Williamsburg District, S. C., group migration from, 172.
- Wilson, Charles R., 439.
- Wilson, Woodrow, candidacy for presidential nomination, 234-42; strength in Baltimore convention, 243-45; impression of H. B. Adams, 5; Dodd's interest in, 28-29.
- Wilson Era: Years of Peace, 1910-1917*, by Josephus Daniels, revd., 276-77.
- Wiltse, Charles M., *John C. Calhoun, Nationalist, 1782-1828*, revd., 108-12.
- Winston, Robert W., deceased, 128.
- Winther, Oscar O., 570.
- Wisconsin Historical Society, guide to manuscripts, noted, 288.
- Wise, Henry A., opposes northern business interests, 204, 212.
- Wood, Harry H., on Charleston stage, 546.
- Woodward, C. Vann, 571.
- Woolfe, L. I., on Charleston stage, 542.
- Woolley, Edwin C., 20.
- Wright, Dionysius, agent of Nicholson, 71.
- Wright, Horatio G., 553.
- Wright, Louis B., "William Byrd's Opposition to Governor Francis Nicholson," 68-79; (ed.), *An Essay upon the Government of the English Plantations on the Continent of America (1701)*, revd., 564-65.
- Yancey, William L., 493; Petrie's interest in, 16.
- Yancey, William T., friend of General Early, 555-58.
- Yearns, Wilfred B., 572.
- Yonge, Julien C., 285.
- Yulee, David L., interest in blockade-running, 219-21.
- Zion Church, established in Maury County, Tenn., 172.
- Zorn, Roman J., 440.
- Zouaves, on Charleston stage, 539.